

UVIC - McPHERSON



3 2775 90470216 3

The Peace Movement in America

A facsimile reprint collection



"Peace"

Jerome S. Ozer, Publisher

1972

Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 71-143431

This edition is reprinted from a copy in the
collection of The University of Illinois Library

Manufactured in the United States of America

Swords and Ploughshares

Swords and Ploughshares

or

The Supplanting of the System of War
by the System of Law

By

Lucia Ames Mead

Author of "Milton's England," etc.

With a Foreword by Baroness von Suttner

The God of war is now a man of business with vested interests.

Zangwill.

G. P. Putnam's Sons
New York and London
The Knickerbocker Press

JX1953
M55

COPYRIGHT, 1912

BY

LUCIA AMES MEAD

The Knickerbocker Press, New York

FOREWORD

HAVING been for many years in touch with the leading peace workers of America and an assiduous reader of the voluminous supply of pamphlets, books, and articles, which have flooded your country with the discussion of the great subject of the supplanting of the war system of nations by justice and reason, I have concluded that America is far in the forefront in the propaganda of the peace ideal, as in definite plans to bring it into realisation. Its adherents, representing as they do the highest and most influential circles of state, as well as the ablest scholars and religious leaders, have prominently pushed the subject internationally. In literature, in politics, in science, the most prominent men and women of America stand for the world's peace. From out of your beneficent private purses generous provisions have been poured for peace foundations. These several circumstances have awakened among us European pacifists the confident

hope that the New World will lead the definite advance in this greatest movement of the twentieth century.

I crossed the ocean to express this hope to our American co-workers. I have reported to them how imperatively the revival of militarism in Europe makes it important and necessary that we be helped from here. To my astonishment, I find that, while the cause is espoused by your great-souled leaders everywhere, the mass of the public seems astonishingly uninformed when the peace movement is mentioned. To my great sorrow, I have also observed in certain circles even a strong military tendency and concern for national war-readiness, which has either not wholly died out of some inheritance from your past or is slowly invading your continent. I have asked myself whether its importation has perhaps been prompted by the European jingoes or by continental gun-agents. After reading this book, I confess myself more clear as to the source of this expanding militarism in your midst. I have learned much from its pages that I did not know before. It has made me realise the extent of the advance of militarism in the United States in these last years. The element of hope is in the fact that it is probably a comparatively small number of men who have pulled the strings, that the great body of the public is undoubtedly right-minded, and that right action will surely

follow the fuller education for which American peace workers must pull together. I believe we need not fear for the results here, for there are too many peace forces at work, and their energies are wonderfully increasing. Those who are still apathetic and indifferent to what is going on in this great conflict against war must be informed and helped and urged to take up this most commanding issue of civilisation.

Such books as Mrs. Mead's *SWORDS AND PLOUGHSHARES* come therefore as a natural response to a pressing demand. I have read the sheets with keenest pleasure. The work is written with earnestness, with knowledge, and with logic, and imparts with breadth of view a vast amount of needed information. Pacifism, which a few decades ago was a mere theory, has of late unfolded into a true science. Mrs. Mead's reputation and ability as an investigator in this science places her contribution of timely, trenchant essays into the list of authentic text-books. Its condensed but illuminating history and development of the movement, its clear statement of the aims and arguments, and its keen exposure of the fallacies of its opponents and of the obstacles that are being raised to block its progress, give to the volume a high value. *SWORDS AND PLOUGHSHARES* puts the subjects which it treats into most available and helpful form for students and for lecturers and teachers. It gives instruction as well as

inspiration for peace lovers, and commands for itself a place in the library of the historian, the politician, and the sociologist.

While I came to America at this time to speak to all classes which it was in my power to reach upon the peace cause which lies so close to my heart, it was my central aim and wish to appeal to the women of America, who are far better organised than their sisters in Europe, and whose central organisation has this year for the first time made the definite and persistent study of our cause and devotion to this cause a regular feature of its remarkable and most beneficent work. What may not these millions of thoughtful and earnest American women accomplish for the world! It was the English Ruskin who said that whenever the women of the world really make up their minds to put a period to war, they can do it. I recall the prophetic word of your great Justice Brewer: "Nowhere in the world is woman so potent a force in public life as in this country, and you may be sure that that force will be ere long concentrated in steadfast opposition to war." I do not need to remind you that the reason why your noble Julia Ward Howe threw herself into the work of founding women's clubs, a work which has grown to proportions of which she could not have dreamed, was that she wished thereby to create a powerful weapon for the war against war. Remembering these things, it is

for the women of America, now in the fulness of time and the urgency of need, to do the great work which it is in their power to do for the peace and order of the world.

BERTHA VON SUTTNER.

BOSTON, September 29, 1912.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I.—HISTORY OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT— A BRIEF OUTLINE	I
II.—NATIONAL DANGERS AND NATIONAL DEFENCE	23
III.—INTERDEPENDENCE	48
IV.—MAKERS OF MILITARISM	64
V.—THE NAVY AS “INSURANCE”	79
VI.—SOME FALLACIES OF ADMIRAL MAHAN’S	90
VII.—NEUTRALISATION AND NON-INTER- COURSE	111
VIII. THE PROBLEM OF THE PHILIPPINES .	121
IX.—TWO MASTER MINDS	136
X.—TEACHING PATRIOTISM	153
XI.—TEACHING INTERNATIONALISM	162
XII.—PATRIOTIC SONGS, SYMBOLS, AND SO- CETIES	178

CHAPTER	PAGE
XIII.—THE PROGRESS OF ARBITRATION .	191
XIV.—HOPEFUL NEW AGENCIES FOR PEACE .	199
XV.—WHAT MIGHT HAVE BEEN, HAS BEEN, AND WILL BE ACHIEVED . . .	225
APPENDIX	232
INDEX	247

Swords and Ploughshares

CHAPTER I

HISTORY OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT

A BRIEF OUTLINE

IN 1860, millions of American citizens maintained that slavery was ordained of God, inevitable, a necessity for civilisation. No one of them or of their descendants maintains that view to-day. As the great task of the nineteenth century was to end man-selling, so the task of the twentieth century, says Andrew Carnegie, is to end man-killing, and the sceptics answer as before: "War is inevitable, it is bound up with human nature," or, as a certain military officer writes in one of the magazines: "As the unoccupied reaches of the earth's surface grow smaller, competition between races and nations must inevitably increase in intensity, and war power, which is the ultimate form of competitive capacity, must exercise even greater influence in the future than in the past." Some people are still fooled by this pseudo-economic wisdom; but the period has passed when such

dicta have weight except with visionaries who are blind to the meaning of history or to the new economics of the twentieth century. As, however, there are still many visionaries with facile pens, practical pacifists must patiently unravel the intellectual tangle in which vague definitions, half truths, guesses at history and ignorance of the new organic unity of economic interests have left many persons, despite their diplomas, degrees, and cleverness in mathematics, languages, and physics.

A little survey of well-known historic facts may properly precede discussion and may recall to the reader that the peace movement was not born with the Czar's rescript nor cradled by a Carnegie Peace Endowment. We pass by the sublime, prophetic visions of Isaiah and Micah, the heavenly wisdom of the gospels, the centuries of early Christian non-resistance, when the Church grew apace until political power and prosperity degraded it, to the time of Dante's boyhood, when there appeared in the beautiful old city of Coutances in Normandy, a young lawyer, Pierre Du Bois by name. We know little of this student of Saint Thomas Aquinas, but we do know that before Dante's *De Monarchia* had presented the conception of peace through a world-empire he proposed an international representative organisation. He would have had a congress of princes institute a permanent tribunal of arbitration, composed of chosen judges, from whom six should be selected to try a case. Six hundred years later,

in 1899, the first Hague Conference agreed to practically the same plan as was outlined by the lawyer of Coutances. But in his day the nations were not ready; they must wait. In 1624, *Le Nouveau Cynée* (the New Cyneas) by Eméric Crucé, appeared in Du Bois's country, and was the first book that explicitly developed the thought of a regular system of arbitration. It was followed by *The Great Design* of Henry IV, published fifty years after his death in the posthumous memoirs of his great minister, the Duke of Sully. This was the first comprehensive scheme in modern history to organise the world. The king or his minister (there is much controversy about it) had planned a federation of the European states, with a central senate and proportionate contributions from the various nations to the common international army and navy, which should insure the substitution of legal methods for the prevailing system of war. Ravaiillac's dagger, in 1610, frustrated this scheme, just at the time that little John Milton was learning to talk and Shakespeare had completed his greatest tragedies and was retiring from London to Stratford.

But the world was still not ready, and its organisation must be postponed three centuries as a practical political achievement. One class of hideous wrongs, however, could be ameliorated. Five years after the little band of English exiles coming out of Holland had reared their first log cabin beside Plymouth Rock, the greatest scholar

and benefactor whom that same brave little Holland ever produced published an epoch-making book—*The Rights of War and Peace*. On July 4, in 1899, the hundred diplomats assembled at the first Hague Conference, led by the head of our American delegation, Dr. Andrew D. White, travelled together to ancient Delft and, after gazing on the noble statue of Hugo Grotius which adorns the square, entered the great bare church where Grotius lies buried. As each national group arrived, their ears were greeted by the organ notes of their own national air. There, in an august company, they gathered around the marble monument while the representatives from America in behalf of their government and people laid a superb silver wreath upon it, as Ambassador White delivered a eulogy on the immense service which this great soul had wrought for all mankind. "Of all works," said he, "not claiming to be inspired, *The Rights of War and Peace* has proved the greatest blessing to humanity."

The prodigious learning of this great scholar, who was sought by the elegant young Milton on his visit to Paris because he said he venerated him more than any other living man, and the cumulative force of his legal and ethical arguments, reinforced by copious citations from the ancients, gradually produced a marvellous effect on an age accustomed to savage butchery in war, in which neither age nor sex nor the helplessness of wounded and prisoners had availed to secure either justice

or clemency. The world may thank Hugo Grotius primarily for the kindly treatment which in recent wars Americans gave to Spanish prisoners and Japanese gave to Russians.

The Rights of War and Peace was the first great attempt to deduce a principle of right and a philosophic basis for society independent of biblical and ecclesiastical authority. It had an immediate effect all over Europe. Gustavus Adolphus is said to have slept during his campaigns with a copy under his head of this great work by the man who is properly called "the father of International Law."

His unlearned but ardent contemporary in England, George Fox, born three years before the publication of *The Rights of War and Peace*, began a movement as permanent as the influence of this book. In his quaint suit of leather, this preacher of the inner light fared up and down the city streets during the Civil War boldly proclaiming, "Woe, woe to the bloody city": He and the great body of Friends, his followers, like the early Christian martyrs, endured dungeons, and stripes and persecution of every kind, but they stood steadfast in their faith, fighting with their tongues, which sometimes were sharp indeed, and receiving the appellation, "Quakers," because they made the enemies of peace to quake, not because they themselves had faltered. A few of them later, founding the City of Brotherly Love, treated the natives of the New World so justly that as every

schoolboy knows, they had their reward in long years of peace.

A half century rolled on after the appearance of Grotius's great book and the beginning of Fox's preaching, and this time another Englishman, a follower of Fox, the high-bred scholar and New World pioneer, William Penn, the founder of that Philadelphia, presented a scheme for "The Present and Future Peace of Europe." This plan was for a general alliance or compact among the different states of Europe to form a Diet or Congress of Nations. Unlike the *Great Design* of the French king's, this was the first scheme free from suspicion of ulterior motive and inspired purely by love of humanity. But still the nations were not ready.

The profoundest philosophic word of the eighteenth century about the great problem that made Franklin declare "there never was a good war nor a bad peace" was uttered by Immanuel Kant, the master mind of Germany, in his essay on *Eternal Peace*, published at the very time that our Constitution had made our little group of thirteen states already a world power. Kant's great insight was that the world's peace can never be permanently attained until the world is organised, and it can never be safely organised until its constituent nations have achieved self-government. In his day, any degree of representative government was the rare exception. Even Great Britain's House of Commons, so late as 1866, represented only one man in four. World organisation, had it

been possible in Kant's day, would have been chiefly a compact between monarchs, and the only peace obtained would have been that in which the mighty dominate the weak—a peace that portends slavery or revolution. In the period which has elapsed since the sage of Königsberg taught the world the secrets of the starry heavens and of the mind of man, as well as the principles of peace with justice, scarcely a single independent nation has been left which has not achieved, however feebly, some form of representative government. Even the immobile Orient has awakened, and the latent patriotism of China demands liberty and a republic. The world has witnessed a silent revolution in the minds of men more stupendous and far-reaching than perhaps all that the previous thousand years had wrought. The master minds of physics in the realm of invention have almost annihilated time and space and have brought reports to every breakfast table of yesterday's doings in Tokio, Melbourne, and Constantinople. No longer is it necessary to chronicle the words, "And still the nations are not ready, but must wait," for now the fulness of time has come, and world organisation becomes not only a possibility, but a practical necessity. Its prototype has been tested for nearly a century and a quarter.

When Washington, Franklin, Madison, and their great compeers, less than a hundred in all, sat down in that fateful summer of 1787 behind locked doors in Independence Hall in the City of Broth-

erly Love to wrestle with their problem, they were helping to solve, all unwittingly, not their own problem alone, but that of the whole world. The group of thirteen quarrelsome colonies, bound by a rope of sand, seemed approaching dissolution. So tense was hostility between Connecticut and New York, for instance, due among other things to the latter's custom duties at her border line, that in one town the merchants banded themselves together to forbid any citizen carrying over merchandise into New York for a year, under penalty of paying two hundred and fifty dollars fine. The citizens of Maine and Georgia were much farther apart in sympathy than are those of Canada and New Zealand to-day. The sailboat and horse—the conveyances of Abraham and Alexander—and the little four-page newspaper were all that served as mediums between them. How little those be-wigged giants of statesmanship, sitting in that classic hall, could realise how the little candle they were lighting was to become the great torch of liberty enlightening the whole world, throwing its beams to far Cathay and waking the myriads from slumber, lightening the gloom of suffering millions the world over, by showing where to find the key to unlock prison bars! They thought only of the task in hand; but, in solving the problem of creating a United States, they also showed the essential method of creating a United World. The glory of our government and our people is that, more than any other on God's earth, have they

been able to contribute to humanity the secret of attaining peace with justice. The latest critic of the Supreme Court, that most original feature of the mighty work which the Constitutional Convention created, has said: "In the only opportunity ever given the Supreme Court to prevent war, it failed." Is not the accusation false to history? Did the Court ever fail to do what it was created to do? Despite interstate quarrels, sometimes concerning boundary lines, vital interests, and honor, it has from the beginning settled quietly, one after another, the numerous differences arising between states which, unsettled, would have meant war. Forty-eight states from the Atlantic to the Pacific, containing now ninety millions of people, have had peace and justice around the border lines of each, notwithstanding the reckless riots, the murders, lynchings, and disorders that have disgraced civilisation within those borders. The one instance referred to as a "failure," when half the country was ready to rise in arms to overthrow the national government, was in the nature of the case one with which no court was meant to cope. The critic's further inference that The Hague Court would fail when tested on a serious issue, could apply only when, following the analogy, one half of the world should find itself fundamentally and bitterly opposed to the other half and should choose universal war rather than reason. If such an unthinkable insanity should ever wipe out civilisation, naturally The Hague

Court would fail, but only if it had once become the acknowledged arbiter between governments.

The year that opens the Third Hague Conference, 1915, will mark the centenary of the founding of the first Peace Society the world ever saw. When the New York merchant, David Low Dodge, established this first Peace Society, he made membership in a Christian church a pre-requisite to membership in his society; and the peace movement in America and England has been essentially a Christian movement ever since, though naturally, except at the beginning, it has made no such condition of membership. Almost invariably the Hebrews the world over are counted among the friends of peace, and on the continent of Europe the ablest of the free-thinkers are often found to be ardent pacifists. Following the leadership of David Low Dodge, the noble ancestor of illustrious descendants, and in the same year, the Massachusetts Peace Society was started in Boston by Noah Worcester and William Ellery Channing. In these days of international courts and conferences which seem to novices to have sprung up full-fledged in the last fifteen years, it is well for students to turn back to the heroes and pioneers who in New England thought out the methods of world organisation and international justice before the present actors in the world's great drama were born. They died before they saw the fruition of their toil and tears and hopes; but the statesmen who met at The Hague Confer-

ence in 1899 owed their success largely to these men, who had in the thirties and forties marked out what came to be known in Europe as the "American plan." William Ladd, whose work indeed deserves a monument, must in this brief survey be passed with no adequate word of eulogy. Charles Sumner, who was as valiant a champion of peace as he was of the abolition of slavery, in three powerful addresses, and especially in "The True Grandeur of Nations," said almost all that could be said before those later special contributions to the subject by Jean de Bloch and Norman Angell, based upon our new conditions. Elihu Burritt, "the learned blacksmith," a marvellous self-made scholar with the heart of a child, brought about cheap ocean postage and, working untiringly both at home and in Europe, shared with his great contemporaries, Cobden, Bright, Richard, Victor Hugo, in the great task of stirring the nations still suffering from Napoleon's exhausting wars. Upon the centenary of Burritt's birth, in 1910, the polyglot city of New Britain in Connecticut, where he was born and where his body lies, closed banks and shops and schools, and forty nationalities in native costumes, marching with banners and their national music in high festival, celebrated the birth of him who, of all citizens of his state, had best illustrated the meaning of the motto on the great banner flung that day to the breeze, "Above all nations is humanity." To Elihu Burritt more than to any other was due the success of the great

International Peace Congresses in Europe in the middle of the last century.

The Crimean War, in which Lord Salisbury later said that England "placed her money on the wrong horse," our Civil War, and the wars in Italy, Austria, France, and Germany, delayed for thirty years the advance of the peace movement. In 1889, a man of lowly birth, who had known the sharpness of poverty, founded an institution more powerful for accomplishment for international peace and progress than any other except The Hague Conferences. William Randall Cremer, a member of Parliament, afterward knighted for his achievement, initiated the Interparliamentary Union, composed of members of the world's parliaments, which deals with all questions of public international law that concern the maintenance of peace. To-day this organisation, numbering over three thousand members, has brought the peace movement into the realm of practical politics. Its chief early accomplishment was the presentation to the Interparliamentary Conference in 1895 of the draft for the organisation of a Permanent Court of Arbitration. To a large extent this work was later adopted by the first Hague Conference.¹

¹ The Interparliamentary Union meets annually in the different capitals. Its executive authorities are the Interparliamentary Council, composed of two members from each group, and an Executive committee, composed of five members from five different groups. The President of Council is M. A. Beernaert, Belgian minister of State, Brussels; the General Secretary, Dr. Chr. L. Lange, 251 Avenue du Longchamps, Brussels. The

In August, 1898, like a bolt from the blue, came the Czar's manifesto calling a conference of the twenty-six nations having ambassadors at his court to consider the limitation of armaments. The call was received with coldness and scepticism in many quarters. "The Czar's proposal for disarmament goes against nature and against civilisation; this alone condemns it," wrote one German editor. "The Czar's advocacy of peace is perhaps a stimulus to war," wrote another. "Disarmament would make wars more frequent," wrote Dr. E. von Hartmann. "Peace will never be better assured than by a thoroughly drilled army ready for instant service," quoth the Kaiser a month later. But in England there was hope, and, week by week, a new journal entitled *War against War*, edited by William T. Stead, went broadcast through the English-speaking world, showing in each number a map covered with black dots marking the English towns where peace meetings had in the last week been held. Arguments, statistics, and illustrations from De Bloch's powerful new work were cited to show the great opportunity about to be opened to civilisation at The Hague.

The little neutral country of Holland was selected as presenting the best kind of meeting-place for such diverse elements, and the offer of the Queen's "House in the Wood" as a place of

Union receives small annual subventions from different governments, and issues various series of publications.

assembly was accepted. On the Czar's birthday, May 18, 1899, one hundred appointed delegates with their attachés held a brief first session in the circular hall, decorated on all sides by great frescoes of war and peace; by courtesy, Baroness von Suttner, the sole lady, was admitted. Ambassador de Staal of Russia was elected president; and thereafter, with the press excluded, the work was carried on behind closed doors. De Bloch, the great authority on militarism, arrived, presented his *Future of War* in six volumes to each delegate, gave dinners, and lectured with stereopticon on the futility of modern war. Pacifists from every land assembled and shared in the tense excitement as, bit by bit, the news of progress leaked out from behind the closed doors. Mr. Stead, fresh from a visit to the Czar was of great service here.

The members of the Conference, meeting for the most part in scepticism, soon found themselves under the inspiration of Lord Pauncefote, Ambassador White, Bourgeois of France, Nigra of Italy, and a few others, men of courage and vision, working diligently in three committees from morning to night, forming friendships as they lunched together and together attended social functions. At one period during the Conference, German indifference and even hostility seemed about to wreck it. In this exigency, Dr. White commissioned Frederick W. Holls of our American delegation, a prominent member of the New York bar, to carry a letter to

Minister von Bülow. In this letter he made a noble and powerful plea for the principle of arbitration and showed what wrong the Kaiser's ministers would do if they should permit him, a "ruler of such noble ambitions and admirable powers," to draw upon himself the resentment of the world through frustrating progress at the Conference. Mr. Holls carried with him manifold evidences of American enthusiasm for arbitration—among others a cable message from thirty-one Baptist clergymen in Oregon and a prayer written by the Bishop of the Episcopal Church in Texas, to be used every Sunday during the session of the Conference. Chancellor Hohenlohe, though a Roman Catholic, was especially affected by reading a copy of this prayer. The letter of Mr. White was presented to the Kaiser with friendly recommendations from these statesmen; and Count Münster, head of the German delegation had sent Dr. Zorn to Berlin on a similar mission; indifference gave way to co-operation and hostility ceased.

The diaries of Dr. White and the Baroness von Suttner reflect vividly the stress and strain of the momentous experience until, after necessary compromises and the reservation by the Americans that nothing agreed to involved any abandonment of the traditional attitude of the United States towards questions purely American, the conventions at last were signed and sealed. The problem proposed by the Czar of lessening the burden of

armaments had not been solved but the logical precedent condition for the reduction of armaments had been decreed. The Permanent International Tribunal of Arbitration, with a panel of judges appointed by the signatory powers, was now assured. More had been accomplished for world organisation in three months than in the previous three centuries. Mankind entered the new century with the rational hope that ere it ended duels between nations would be as obsolete as are to-day duels between men in all English-speaking countries.

After the ratification of the conventions and the opening at The Hague, in April, 1901, of the mansion which was to be the temporary headquarters of the Permanent International Tribunal, scepticism again prevailed. "You have got your court, but no one has used it, and no one will use it except for trifling issues," was the cry. The smart critic is far too ready to help the public to forget that in all progress there must be first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear, and that evolution in efficiency and gain in confidence are as necessary in achieving world-organisation as in achieving aviation. But in much less time than it took the Supreme Court of the United States to receive its first case, that Court having met and adjourned repeatedly for over two years without being called to adjudicate, President Roosevelt, acting on the suggestion of Baron d'Estournelles de Constant, then on a visit to the United States,

arranged with President Diaz to send to the Tribunal a long-standing case, involving money, known as the "Pious Fund Case." According to the Hague Convention, each country selected two judges from the large panel of judges and these four selected a fifth to try the case. This was soon settled in favour of the United States. It was of signal service in giving prestige to the court and was soon followed by the Venezuelan case, involving eleven nations, which was at first referred to President Roosevelt for arbitration, but again, following wise counsels, he declined in favour of the Hague Tribunal.

During the Russo-Japanese War, which followed close upon the Conference, the Dogger Bank episode, as it was called, once more showed the result of that momentous conference of 1899. As the Russian Admiral's fleet was passing through the North Sea, on its long and fateful voyage around two continents, after being warned to beware of possible Japanese torpedo-boats, it fired upon some English fishing vessels in the dusk killing two men, wounding others, and hurried on apparently unconscious of the evil it had wrought. Instantly England was in white heat; the press breathed forth threatenings and it seemed for a few days as if only blood could wipe out blood. Fortunately the provision for a Commission of Enquiry, one of the provisions of the Hague conventions was invoked by France. The admirals were halted, sent to Paris to face the surviving

fishermen, and an impartial committee composed of admirals from five countries listened to the testimony. The Russians were exonerated of any purpose to wrong England, but asked to pay \$300,000 to the widows and injured, which they were only too glad to do.

A few months later, after the destruction of the Russian fleet by Admiral Togo, President Roosevelt wrote the preface to one of the greatest romances of history by inviting the belligerent nations at our antipodes to send representatives to settle in Kittery navy-yard one of the greatest of modern wars. Had it not been for a third provision of the Hague conventions, providing for Mediation as well as for Arbitration and Enquiry, this romance of the Portsmouth treaty could hardly have been recorded in the annals of history.

The cynicism of many who thought the Hague Court useless because it did not prevent the Russo-Japanese War and the Boer War was due to ignorance of the situation. The Transvaal was not represented at The Hague as it was not a truly independent state. Needless and terrible as the Boer War was, it does not in the least discredit the Hague Tribunal's usefulness when nations pledge themselves to use it. The Russo-Japanese War ought to have been prevented had the world been a little further organised. It accused the powers as well as the two nations involved. Whatever the weakness, follies, and cruelty of which the Czar is

guilty, his sincerity in calling the Hague Conference ought not to be questioned.

In 1904, Congress invited the Interparliamentary Union to our shores, voting fifty thousand dollars for the entertainment of its members, and President Roosevelt welcomed a delegation of two hundred of these in Washington after their meeting at St. Louis. At their request, he at once took steps to convene a second Hague Conference. Owing to the fact that the Russo-Japanese War had not then ended and, later, to the occurrence of the Pan-American Conference in South America, the Conference finally called by the Czar of Russia with the President's consent did not meet until the summer of 1907.

This time, not twenty-six only, but forty-six nations were invited—practically the whole civilised world—and all nations but Costa Rica and Honduras were represented in the Hall of the Knights, a thirteenth-century banquet hall, called into requisition at The Hague for the two hundred and fifty-six delegates. As one looked down from the gallery upon this long hall hung with rich Oriental rugs, one saw half-way down its length the white-headed President Nelidoff of Russia, sitting on a green dais beneath a green canopy, and encircling him from right to left, in alphabetical order, the groups of delegates, varying from one to fifteen, yet each nation voting as a unit. Beginning with *Allemagne*, was the imposing figure of Baron Marshal von Bieberstein with his colleagues;

there were Hon. Joseph Choate and General Horace Porter and their associates from the United States; there were the silk robes of the Chinese delegates; heading the Brazilian group was blue-eyed Ruy Barbosa, a man of eloquence, who had succeeded in putting into the constitution of his country the prohibition of any conquest of territory by war. Farther still were the keen-eyed, courteous, little men from Japan; and at the extreme left one spied the red fezes of the Turks and the representatives of Uruguay and Venezuela. There was little that was spectacular in this body of sober men, who had discarded uniforms and all decorations, but no one of insight could be blind to the thrilling fact that this assembly presented one of the most sublime spectacles the world had ever seen. Here for the first time in human history, practically the whole world had met together under one roof and for world business—to substitute the reign of law for war.

The complete actual results, recounted elsewhere, were not all that many had hoped. The partial accomplishments were far greater, but attracted slight attention. When practical unanimity is required to secure any agreement to conventions, progress must be slow. How many bills would pass Congress or any legislatures if approximate unanimity were required? But to have attained the consent of two-thirds to measures in 1907 means perhaps unanimous consent to them at the next Conference, in 1915. If nothing more

had been accomplished that cold, wet summer than four months' patient, courteous discussion of the delicate and difficult questions involved, by the weary men who daily met and did their work under great difficulties of language, it would have been richly worth the while. But great advance was made, not the least step in which was the provision for the Third Hague Conference. This doubtless means a fourth and a fourteenth and fortieth. That the world must organise, the most blatant chauvinist can now no longer question.

Baroness von Suttner and hundreds of friends of peace assembled at The Hague, giving addresses and in courteous, helpful ways adding moral support to the proceedings. William T. Stead, as alert as a young man of thirty, with his remarkable journalistic genius for scenting news and perceiving the significance of each step, rendered invaluable, untiring, almost sleepless service by publishing a daily illustrated paper devoted solely to the interests of the Conference, which served as a medium of information to the delegates as well as to the public. This time the plenary sessions were open to the representatives of the press and to others fortunate enough to secure tickets of admission; but the chief work was done in committees.

Since the summer of 1907, the world has seen almost unbroken peace between the nations and the prevention of at least four wars that threat-

ened. Treaties of arbitration have multiplied and despite civil wars and the growth of armaments the cause of international peace has made marked advance.

CHAPTER II

NATIONAL DANGERS AND NATIONAL DEFENCE

THE kind of defence and the amount of defence needed anywhere depend upon the kind of danger and the amount of danger existing. A rocky coast needs many lighthouses; a safe coast, few. Berlin, which is practically fire-proof, requires few fire-engines and is proud of having fewer than our flimsily-built cities necessitate. A nation that has little danger from without should exult if it needs few battleships; nothing except dire danger can excuse the taxation of toilers of the world for dreadnoughts. Some years ago, an American Admiral, resenting protests against spending money on the navy, asked, "Why does not the speaker turn his attention to the waste of six hundred million dollars in fires which a proper civilisation would prevent? Expenditure upon the navy is but a triviality in comparison with that." A singular comparison indeed! One may compare one evil with another or one preventive with another—fire-engines with navy, fire with war; but if a navy is a preventive of war, as it is claimed, its cost can only be compared with the

cost of the preventives of fire, not with the loss by fire. If they can command more power of logic than the Admiral's, there would be nothing more profitable for Americans than to consider carefully their dangers in connection with the respective preventives which they have supplied for them.

In arraigning our extravagance and waste, the Admiral might have gone further and reminded us that we are the most homicidal of civilised nations. We murder, out of every million citizens, 129 every year, while just across the border, in Canada, only three out of every million are slain. We are the most wasteful and extravagant people on earth. We have destroyed in four recent years of peace at least 60,000 more precious lives by accident than perished by bullets on both sides in the whole four years of our bloody Civil War. In one year, New York City alone lost three thousand more American lives by violent deaths than were slain in three years of the Philippine War. We destroy by fire about seven times as much annually as does all Europe. This is said to be equal to the cost of half the new buildings erected in the United States every year. Said Professor Giddings of Columbia University: "For three hundred years we have been a herd of wild asses in the wilderness. There have been other herds in other lands in all ages, but no other has accomplished an equal amount of damage in so short a time." Our civic corruption and gigantic land thefts, sugar frauds, and insurance graft have astounded Europe, and

made it a common question whether the Americans do not care most of all for money. We have still about 6,000,000 illiterates and we pay our average school-teacher less than an average street-sweeper; yet with ignorance, recklessness, waste, preventable disease, accident, and crime attacking our fair land on every hand we are spending our chief thought on possible enemies over seas.

Since our republic was founded, it has never been attacked. We ourselves began all our three foreign wars: the War of 1812, which would probably not have occurred if we had had an Atlantic cable and known of England's concession in withdrawing the Orders in Council which were the main cause of the war; the Mexican War, which was primarily fought in the interests of the slave power and, in the words of Hon. John W. Foster, was a war of "conquest and injustice"; the Spanish War, which would probably not have opened, in the opinion of our then minister to Spain, General Woodford, had Congress waited forty-eight hours. In all these three foreign wars combined, including the Philippine adjunct to our Spanish War, we lost *less than fifteen thousand men by foreign bullets*. For these past wars and for preparation for future wars, the United States, protected by two oceans, without an enemy in the whole world, is paying *about seventy cents out of every dollar of its income*, leaving only thirty cents of every dollar to spend on all national necessities and constructive work. Imagine, my dear house-

holder, spending seventy per cent of your family income on stone-walls and moats, burglar alarms and bull-dogs, and having only thirty per cent left for the housing, clothing, and education of your family. For the national family, Uncle Sam has thirty cents on the dollar left for the payment of Congress, the President, Cabinet, all the federal courts, federal prisons, custom house buildings and officers, post-office buildings, coast-guard, light-houses, census, printing, diplomatic and consular service, forestry, waterways, quarantine, irrigation, agricultural and other departments, mints, etc.

It requires more imagination to enable us to absorb and digest these simple facts than most intelligent Americans seem to possess. Is not the logic of our losses and expenditure precisely the reverse of our worthy Admiral's? If all these dangers mentioned above and the many not mentioned exist within our midst, against which we are spending but a fraction for defence compared with our expenditures on armaments and pensions, are we not reversing the normal order and putting our greatest defence where it is least needed and our least defence where it is most needed? It is a state of mind very much to be dreaded, said John Ruskin, for a man not to know the devil when he sees him. It is a state of mind still more to be dreaded when a nation does not know its real enemies from bogeys.

Despite the fact that for thirty years before the

Civil War and from 1872 to 1898 we had a small navy, we were a world power; our democracy, as Lowell said, was undermining every monarchy in Europe. Our beloved land did not first become a world power when Dewey sank a few old Spanish ships. Ever since the Constitution was ratified and began to serve as the basis of the dozens of national constitutions written since, we have been a world power, and have been recognised as such. It was once our pride and glory that we need not burden ourselves with the millstone of militarism that the great powers of Europe have hung around their necks. To-day with our new militarism and big navy craze and under the clamour of certain vested interests which want contracts for military equipments, we are following Old World methods and follies without the Old World's excuse. A spirit of vain emulation has been goading us to economic madness. Though we are comparatively rich, we can ill afford the gigantic price we are paying for this either real or assumed new timidity and this humiliating scare which our huge navy implies. Since Washington's time, our population has increased about 23 times and our area perhaps three times; we have increased our naval expenses alone over 120 times! Our armaments have increased five times as fast as our population.

We are told periodically, just before the vote on the naval budget, that Japan has so many hundred thousand soldiers that she can land upon our shores, and that we are unprepared for possible

dangers. Now Japan will probably not pay off her heavy war debts for a generation and her people are taxed thirty to forty per cent on their incomes. She has a good system of education, but, without proper schoolhouses, her schools are held in sheds. She is expending millions on broadening the gauge of her national railroads which will require years for completion. She needs no expansion, for she has not yet developed her rich, newly acquired island of Formosa, and she has the great peninsula of Korea with millions of discontented natives to pacify and educate. She is spending large sums on Korea, for which she will receive no returns for many years; in railroads alone she has spent \$40,000,000 in that country. She has her Manchurian railroad and commerce to develop and must keep constant guard against her former enemies, China and Russia. Japan, like Germany, is turning from agriculture to manufactures and commerce and, like Germany, is beginning to be able to feed increasing millions by purchasing whatever food she does not grow. Neither nation needs expansion in order to feed its people. With twenty more millions of mouths to feed than in 1870, Germany has reduced her emigration until now it is much less than that of the United States.

It is claimed that Japan wants to "dominate the Pacific." This ocean, bordered by eleven countries, is the great highway of nations and no nation can ever dominate it; the expression is

meaningless. The assertion is one of the catch-words of the scare-mongers based on jealousy and suspicion, unworthy of our people, with whom Japan has up to date always kept faith. Should she ever be goaded by our insults or arrogance to attack us she would expose herself to encroachments in the rear from China and Russia, compelling her to divide her navy, and would simply commit national suicide. The physical difficulties in the way of Japanese attack on our shores are thus commented on by Commander Hiraga of the Japanese navy:

“Mr. Hobson and men like him talk about a war between Japan and the United States as if it were the easiest thing in the world to bring about. It is not easy to make war. It is hard. It is hard even in ordinary circumstances, when the belligerent nations have only to cross a boundary line; it is practically impossible when they would have to cross an ocean like the Pacific. I do not intend to talk to you about the sentimental or even the business reasons why a war between Japan and the United States is impossible. I mean simply to point out to you the physical difficulties in the way of such a movement as Capt. Hobson and the men who talk like him seem to contemplate. Did you ever stop to consider the difficulties in the way of moving a division of troops over sea by transport? It seems perfectly easy to do on paper, but in actual experience Hercules himself never had a harder task. We discovered that in our war with Russia. Bear in mind the fact that Manchuria is within striking distance of Japan and that San Fran-

cisco is not. Our work was cut out for us even in the simple matter of landing our troops in Manchuria. To land them in Hawaii would be one hundred times more difficult, to land them in San Francisco would be one thousand times more difficult, to land them in Panama would be impossible. A one-hundred-ton small boat can carry fifty soldiers or less, and that is all. It is 3445 miles from Japan to Hawaii, and 2288 miles from there to San Francisco. I suppose those figures convey nothing to your mind; but if you could realise that the distance from Maine to Florida is only a fraction of the distance between San Francisco and Hawaii, and perfectly inconsiderable when you begin to count up the miles between Honolulu and Yokohama, you might have some idea of what a transport force with a battleship escort would be up against. And then remember this. A transport is a thing almost impossible to protect on a long voyage. Speaking from the military standpoint, it is the hardest thing in the world to guard a transport. To transport a real army we should have to impress every steamer afloat in Japanese waters. Here is one illustration which will show you the practical difficulties in the way of such a thing as Capt. Hobson so easily predicts. During the Russian war, we had a fleet guarding six transports in the Straits of Korea. Three Russian cruisers came along, and sank the transports. Mind you, this was only eighty miles off the Japanese coast, and you might say that they were on our own waters. What would happen if we tried to convoy a fleet of transports across the Pacific Ocean to a point 5000 miles away?"

"Why is it, Captain, that it is so difficult to protect

a transport?" asked some one. The Commander laughed.

"Suppose," he said, "that you were trying to steer three or four small children down a street in New York and that there was somebody who was determined to punch one of them. Don't you think you would have a hard time trying to protect them? You are the battleship in that illustration, and the children are the transports.

"I am not a statesman or a financier," said the Commander, "but any Japanese, and I think a sensible man of any nationality, can see the force of this. In sixteen years we have fought two wars, both of which," he added with a slight smile, "were bigger than your adventure with Spain. Did it ever occur to you how much these wars must have cost and how hard it is to recover from that expense? We know it, if you don't. It is a bitter business lesson, and for some time to come Japan is going to spend her best energies not in arranging for new and more expensive wars, but in trying to pay for the last two. If there were no consideration for morality, decency, or old friendship, the naked fact would still remain—war with America would be too expensive."

On being asked if it were not true that the Philippines were regarded in Japan as geographically a natural complement of their archipelago, he said rather wearily:

"I suppose it is almost impossible to convince an American that the difference of climate between Japan and the Philippines is greater than between any

two sections of the United States. The actual fact is that no Japanese could manage to live permanently in the Philippines. Your soldiers have to be relieved after two years' service in those islands. They can't stand the climate any longer than that. Well, the same thing would be true of a Japanese soldier. I know that sounds strange to your ears, but it is literally true. The difference in temperature alone would make the acquisition of the Philippines very far from being a natural extension to Japan's power. Granted that we wish to expand, our expansion would have to be affected by climatic conditions, and naturally it would be westward, not southward."

Said a well-known congressman not long since:

I am absolutely convinced that there is a criminal conspiracy on foot for the purpose of bringing on a war between the United States and Japan. Thousands upon thousands of dollars are being spent to carry on this propaganda, and I am confident that the plans of these conspirators will unfold themselves before very long. I am convinced that this constant agitation for a war between the two nations is nothing but a subterfuge employed by those people who are determined that this government shall build not less than two battleships each year. To endanger the friendly relations of two great nations in order that selfish interests may be gratified is nothing short of criminal.

Japan's greatest asset is continued friendship with her old-time friend and teacher on this side of the Pacific. Japan is grateful to the country which has been her guide, philosopher, and friend.

The common school system of Japan owes its beginning and much of its success to the suggestion and encouragement of our American scholar, Dr. Murray. For several years he was employed by the Japanese government, and he made the first draft of the system of education which Japan accepted. The English language was made one of the required studies, and thus American ideas and literature have been made familiar, even though the power to speak English has not become universal. It was an American missionary who first suggested a university where students could carry on investigation in the higher branches of learning, and it was this same missionary, Dr. Verbeck, who advised Japan to send out a commission to search through the world and learn whatever was better than Japan already possessed. This advice was accepted by the open-minded government and resulted in the adoption of many new improvements. In medical and sanitary science, Japan has no longer anything to learn from us. In 1875, Japan requested the United States to send some one to instruct the Japanese in regard to a postal system. An expert was sent with assistants who remained in Yokohama three years giving the desired instruction. When other nations hesitated to enter into treaty relations with Japan, America was the first to enter into a treaty which involved for Japan the privileges of the International Postal Union.

During the early days of our relationship with

Japan, the valuable advice of an American consul to include an anti-opium clause in our treaty with her saved her much of the trouble which China experienced regarding the opium traffic. In 1864, when the nations compelled Japan to pay \$3,000,000 indemnity for a slight offence, the American government retained its portion for twenty years untouched in its vaults and finally returned the money to Japan. After debate, as a member of the Japanese Parliament has stated, "it was decided to build a magnificent breakwater and pier where the ships come and go, and so it remains an everlasting monument of the friendship existing between these two nations." It was through American missionaries, as the same Japanese statesman, Shimada, states, that the status of woman in Japan has been raised, and that in spite of previous extreme hostility to Christianity, religious toleration has been achieved without the spilling of a drop of blood.

Said Rev. John H. De Forest, for thirty-five years a missionary in Japan, in reply to a vehement attack made by Congressman Richmond P. Hobson against the Japanese:

You said, "Japan had the war habit for more than eight hundred years; it is with her a question of heredity; it is inevitable that, as the Japanese emerge from wars of their own, they engage in wars with other countries; Japan uses the science and knowledge of the world chiefly for war." Please let me ask you, Captain Hobson, where did you learn this? For two

hundred and fifty years before Commodore Perry's visit, there was no nation on earth that could compare with Japan for the peace habit. While Europe and America were in the midst of long years of bitter wars, revolutions, and mutual slaughters, there was for two hundred and fifty years neither internal nor external disturbance of peace in the empire of Japan. Your sweeping judgment of the national character is that they have the war habit. Probably you did not know that, when Perry opened Japan to the knowledge of Western history, one thing that shocked the Japanese was the awfully bloody histories of the nations on this side of the globe; and one of their greatest moralists, Yokoi Shonan, expressed this wide feeling when he begged his government to send him on a mission to the West, that he might plead with those nations to put an end to the brutal wars which two hundred and fifty years of peace had made Japan profoundly dislike. I take it that you neither read nor speak the Japanese language and so have only second-hand avenues into the literature and history of Japan. So, in your hasty tour through a section of Japan, you could not have noticed that at the entrance of countless towns and villages a high flagstaff stands, at the base of which is written: "Peace Be to This Village." Have you ever compared the national hymn of Japan with those of the nations of the West? Her hymn is of very recent date, hardly thirty years old, and you would expect to find something of "the war habit" that has grown "for eight hundred years" in this hymn. For hymns, to be national, must express the deepest and strongest sentiment of the nation. Not a shadow of war here. We of the West have to

be careful how we sing our national hymns where representatives of different nations are gathered. But Japan's national hymn is so absolutely without the war spirit that it can be sung anywhere in the world without giving offence. Your vivid imagination led you to picture the millions of China, too, as virtually possessed with this same war habit, and you painted in fiery colours those four hundred millions of yellow men, "whose countless soldiers could shoot as straight as we can, and could live on one-tenth of what we should need," descending on our Pacific Coast with irresistible force. Are you not as far afield here as in Japan? I had the honour recently of an interview with the Hon. John W. Foster, who kindly presented me with a copy of his *Present Conditions in China*. With his lengthy diplomatic service in the East, whose people he knows, and whose trusted adviser he has been for decades, he has a right to say in this pamphlet: "For many generations China has been the least warlike of any of the great nations. Her most venerated philosopher and statesman, Confucius, taught her people that nations as well as individuals should settle their differences by appeals to right and justice." In view of these facts, it seemed to me that you had somehow got the wrong perspective, and that you should have reversed your vision and told your audience that we Westerners have the war habit badly, and might well learn something from those oldest and most peaceful nations of the East. I was in Manchuria as a guest of the army for six weeks, and was given in my passport the grade of a colonel. I had letters of introduction from the Premier, Count Katsura, to all the generals and

Marshal Oyama. The Premier is a general of the regular army, and he said to me in all solemnity: "I am a soldier, but I hate war. I tried every possible way to come to a settlement with Russia through peaceful means and, after six months of useless diplomatic correspondence, we simply had to fight for our national existence." This is a true expression of the heart of Japan's generals. Mr. Foster is right in his estimate of the peaceful character of the peoples of the East. What he says agrees with the conclusions I have reached, after thirty-three years of residence there.

After quoting President Taft, then Secretary of War, our Ambassador to Japan, Luke Wright, and Elihu Root, then Secretary of State, as to the entirely peaceful attitude of the Japanese government, Mr. De Forest continues:

These gentlemen are your superiors in everything that pertains to first-hand information on diplomatic matters, and their statements are unequivocally the opposite of yours. I will quote some others who are also very superior to you in their knowledge of the people of Japan. I refer to the missionaries who speak the Japanese language, live with the people, have strong friendships among the educated classes, read the papers, and are agreed on this one vital point—the way the Japanese think about us. They have watched not without anxiety the irresponsible jingo utterances of a section of the American press and their slanders of Japan. They have openly sent their formal message to the people of the United States; and, in view of such utterances as yours, the public should

have the saner views of men who have first-class opportunities for knowing what you can get only in less direct ways. Here is their message:

"While we, as missionaries, have nothing to do with questions of national economics or international politics, yet in matters affecting the mutual good-will of nations, we, as messengers of God's universal Fatherhood and man's universal Brotherhood, are peculiarly interested; and, as Americans now residing in Japan, we feel bound to do all that is in our power to remove misunderstandings and suspicions which are tending to interrupt the long-standing friendship between this nation and our own. Hence, we wish to bear testimony to the sobriety, sense of international justice, and freedom from aggressive designs exhibited by the great majority of the Japanese people and to their faith in the traditional justice and equity of the United States. Moreover, we desire to place on record our profound appreciation of the kind treatment which we experience at the hands of both government and people; our belief that the alleged belligerent attitude of the Japanese does not represent the real sentiments of the nation; and our ardent hope that local and spasmodic misunderstandings may not be allowed to affect in the slightest degree the natural and historic friendship of the two neighbours on opposite sides of the Pacific."

This document is signed by over a hundred men, many of whom have lived in Japan over a quarter of a century. Every one of these men would repudiate without hesitation every one of your assertions to which I have referred. You said with violent gesture that the Japanese attitude towards us "is awful and

wicked." You who evidently know nothing of their press call it "bitter." For the sake of my country's fair name, I want to say publicly that your sweeping and baseless misstatements show colossal ignorance of the character of the Japanese. If our people were not too sensible to take you seriously, if you could carry the majority of our people with you, your words would surely imperil the peace of the world, the large part of which you cruelly insulted. As a citizen of the United States I protest against your "awful and wicked" and "bitter" accusations of a great and friendly nation. For the sake of Japan, whose people I respect and love, and whose spirit I believe will bring generous help to the world in the peaceful solution of the greatest of all the twentieth century problems, the coming together of the East and West, I openly affirm that your statements about the war habit of the Japanese, and their war designs on our Republic, have no better foundation than that furnished by your ignorance of history and of diplomatic usages between governments.

In an article in the *Independent*, Dr. De Forest later said:

Nothing has so amazed Japan as have the insinuations and even charges that she was only watching for a chance to attack us, knowing that she was fully prepared, while we were in no position to defend our island possessions of the Pacific. What Japan has endured of astonishment, of pain, of bitter disappointment, of rising resentment, it would be hard to tell. For, not only has our Republic been her best friend and her "beloved teacher" for half a century, but

Japan has never ceased to have a rare and profound friendship for America. To be held up by her former friend as one with sinister designs, as treacherous, has given her a wound that would be hard to heal were it from any other nation. And the millions of Americans are beginning to see through the purposes of our jingo press and of that envious section of Europe that would delight to involve us in war with Japan.

The treaty signed between the United States and Japan in February, 1911, which remains in force for twelve years, was placed first on the list by President Taft among the few events of the year which he enumerated as important achievements. It removes practically all possible causes of friction, and the accompanying diplomatic notes pledge the Japanese government to prevent an undesirable influx of coolies by a rigid scrutiny of all passports. Japan has reduced her war budget; and, as Ambassador Luke Wright once said, "The talk of war with Japan is not even respectable nonsense."

We are told that we need a huge navy to sustain the Monroe doctrine; but the chief beneficent work of that doctrine was done when we had a very small navy. As for our supposed obligations in the future to protect South America, on which the militants still harp, spite of the Porter-Drago doctrine agreed on at The Hague, which relegates to arbitration quarrels about contractual debts, it should be remembered that South America is becoming perfectly competent to take care of

herself. The conditions existing when the Holy Alliance threatened the autonomy of these weak little countries, untrained in self-government, have completely vanished. In Monroe's day they had no railroads or telegraphs and had every reason to dread European aggression. To-day, with thousands of miles of railroads, tunnels under the Andes, and the Panama Canal soon to enable the fleets sundered by thousands of miles on both sides of the continent easily to bring aid to any nation that was wantonly attacked, all that is needed is a defensive alliance of South American states to insure absolute security with never a thought there of the once venerated Monroe doctrine. The whole continent is homogeneous; language, religion, customs, and the Pan-American conferences are drawing all together. If the United States should announce that, upon the opening of the canal, she would no longer maintain her outworn "doctrine" so far as South America is concerned, there would be no mourning and no sense of insecurity. Geographically, we are nearer Europe than we are to most states in South America, and our lack of large commercial relations with the latter accentuates the absurdity of maintaining that half of the Monroe doctrine which once was needed, when we have already broken the complementary half. In 1898, it suited us to expand beyond this hemisphere. Our sympathy and interest should know no limits, but any pretence of suzerainty or overlordship under pre-

sent conditions of self-help should cease toward our sister republics in South America, whatever may be said of the Caribbean states. The remote possibility of their violent invasion is no longer any basis for a demand for maintenance of battle-ships on our part. Is it not therefore time for the grown-up children to the south of us to plan to co-operate, when the Panama Canal is finished and east and west can easily aid each other, and dispense with a nurse when they no longer need one? These people of one race and one religion are bound eventually to federate.

We are told that we need a great navy to defend the Philippines. Is it likely, when it has cost us over half a billion dollars to conquer the natives and to hold them, that any nation could for twice that sum wrest them from us or, even if so, make a profit where we have lost so much?

It has been frequently said that, at the Second Hague Conference, in 1907, "it was the weight of the American navy that gave force to the words of our delegates." On the contrary, when our naval expenditure in 1899 was far less, our influence was greater. Our navy was then much smaller than that of several other nations, but none exceeded us in influence. In 1907, though England had the largest navy, she accomplished far less at the Hague Conference than did Germany or the United States. It is the fact that at Hague Conferences, personality and moral power count, irrespective of the force behind them, just as in

our Senate a man from little Rhode Island may dominate men from States twenty times as large and populous. Ruy Barbosa of Brazil, Asser of Holland—the recent recipient of a Nobel prize,—Dr. Drago of Argentina, and other representatives of small populations were conspicuous for their influence at The Hague.

The women of this country are responsible equally with men for its defence. Women fight against real enemies that fill our cemeteries with graves; the dreadnoughts face no enemies that yet exist, and soon will go their way to the junk heap. In criticising our misdirection of defence, no criticism is made upon the gallant and able men who silently serve in army and navy. Let it always be declared that it is we, not they, who are perpetuating the antiquated system of settling questions of justice by explosives.

That "government is based on force" is a notion which, says Elihu Root, is "less than half a truth." Yet the fallacy is dinned in every ear, and the public seems to have taken this dangerous and sophistical maxim as axiomatic and deduces many irrelevant doctrines from it, including the doctrine that women should not vote.

The truth is [said T. W. Higginson] that in this age it is the civilian who rules on the throne or behind it, and who makes the fighting men his mere agents. Yonder policeman at the corner looks big and formidable: he protects the women, and over-

awes the boys. But away in some corner of the City Hall, there is some quiet man, out of uniform, perhaps a consumptive or a dyspeptic or a cripple, who can overawe the burliest policeman by his authority as city marshal or as mayor. So an army is but a larger police; and its official head is that plain man at the White House, who makes or unmakes not merely brevet-brigadiers, but major-generals in command, who can by the stroke of the pen convert the most powerful man of the army into the most powerless. Take away the occupant of the position, and put in a woman, and will she become impotent because her name is Elizabeth or Maria Theresa? It is brains that more and more govern the world; and whether those brains be on the throne, or at the ballot-box, they will soon make the owner's sex a subordinate affair. War is the last appeal, and happily in these days the rarest appeal, of statesmanship.

All governments to be sure use force; no government however, least of all a republic, can be *based* on force. The weakest government in the world uses the most force to protect its inherent weakness. Our President needs no guard of thousands of soldiers when he walks the streets, as does the terrified and hated Czar; his security rests on the free consent of a great people to his holding office. No republic rests so much on army and navy as upon money or commerce or roads or the printing-press or the school-ma'am or courts or posts and telegraphs or the good-will of its citizens. We cannot imagine our republic surviving without

each and all of these necessities; but we can easily imagine our navy remaining at the antipodes for a generation and we being none the worse for it.

Our national security from outside attack rests chiefly on the same ground as that of ordinary citizens in ordinary civil life. The chief reason that our neighbours are not committing arson, perjury, and homicide is not because they are afraid of prison cell or hangman's noose. It is because their environment, education, and experience have made such crimes loathsome to them and because they know right well they would have more to lose than gain in the end by turning felons. Only a small minority require the police.

The peace party as such is not opposed to the use of force; but it sharply distinguishes between the kind of force which aims to secure a judicial decision and the kind that aims to settle by explosives such questions as boundaries, or honour, or payment of debts. Navies never compel offenders to go to court. They aim at victory, irrespective of justice. The matter of chief moment is not peace, but justice. There never was a just war; if one side was right, the other side was wrong, and sometimes both were wrong, but never by any possibility were both right; and any measure of justice that was achieved was accompanied by a thousand injustices toward the innocent; therefore war stands condemned.

After the gradual reduction of national armies and navies, a minimum force will doubtless be retained as an international police to maintain law and order and justice. A foreshadowing of this was seen when German, French, English, Japanese, Russian, and American forces, under a German general, marched in 1900 to the relief of the legations at Peking. An international police under world government is an integral part of the programme for an organised world.

The peace movement is primarily a movement for Justice. The scales of justice, not the dove or olive leaf, is the best symbol of the world-wide movement to substitute the system of law for the system of war, and is now so used at national peace congresses.

The peace party has been looked upon as visionary; on the contrary, it is based on precedent and logic, and deals only with reasonable probabilities. The big navy party, ignoring the psychology of internationalism, deals in visionary fashion with hypothetical, theoretical dangers. It is within the limits of possibility that Canada will burn Detroit, that our troops will sack Quebec, that New York will be wiped out by a tidal wave and an earthquake; a million things may be possible, not one of which is in the least probable. Galveston was wiped out by a tidal wave, but shall we therefore spend one hundred million dollars in putting a high wall of reinforced cement around Manhattan? No sane, strong people like ourselves

can be pardoned if we focus attention on mere possibilities of danger, when definite, certain evils daily threaten us within our midst, against which we are grossly unprepared.

CHAPTER III

INTERDEPENDENCE

WHOEVER helps to make nations inter-dependent helps to make them friends. Whoever makes men friends when they were not friends has put a little cog into the great wheel of world organisation.

What has the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome to do with the peace movement? Much, every way. It concerns all people in forty-seven civilised countries who wear wool, or cotton, or linen, or silk, or leather. It concerns all who eat vegetables, or fruits, or cereals, or eggs, or meat. It affects all who use wood, or paper, or who buy, or sell, or make furniture and buildings, whether the material be in raw or finished forms. It affects farmers and farm employees and workers in textile and paper industries. It affects all those who need salvation from the ravages of insect pests and all those who want the trade and custom of those thus affected. It affects whoever desires to prevent famines, to equalise prices, to prevent "corners" in produce on the exchange, and to promote economic justice. It aids all those who

would undermine the war system and give all peoples common economic interests, fair competition, and democracy.

Many men from European countries have come to us with brains that have brought us blessings—Gallatin, Agassiz, Schurz, John Boyle O'Reilly, and a long line of artists, authors, statesmen, and captains of industry. But probably the work of no other, except possibly Carnegie, will last so long or reach so many millions with beneficence as that of a countryman of Jean de Bloch who came here as a child and has through serving all become perhaps the greatest of them all. In 1894, David Lubin, of Sacramento, California, a merchant who had risen from a boyhood of poverty to a competence in middle life, conceived the idea of a unique institution for the benefit of mankind. Recognising that it must be carried out upon an international scale, he looked the world over to discover the political agent whom he could most fittingly enlist to initiate the movement; and, seeing that the King of Italy was a peculiarly sagacious and respected monarch, living in an agricultural country, himself much interested in agriculture, and with more leisure than more ambitious monarchs of larger domains, he pilgrimaged to Rome. After some delay he was promised a five-minute interview with the king. An hour after the door had opened for him, the vigilant attendants found the blue-eyed little man from the far west still there, sitting in democratic fashion on a sofa with his

Majesty, expounding to him the way in which he might make his little country a leader among the nations. The King was profoundly impressed with the vision revealed to him and readily espoused the American's cause, taking the first steps to enlist the interest of the civilised world in establishing at Rome an International Institute of Agriculture, as a clearing-house of information on prospective crops and other agricultural interests. He generously provided an annual income of sixty thousand dollars to the Institute and erected palatial headquarters for it in the Borghese Gardens, the building being formally opened in the summer of 1909. Meanwhile Mr. Lubin visited the capitals of the various great countries, explaining his purpose and pleading in enthusiastic and sometimes vehement language for attention to the great design. For three weeks he waited for an answer from the Secretary of the Chicago Board of Trade as to his judgment upon the merits of his scheme. When at last it came it was to the effect that, if it were carried out, it would probably save annual fluctuations in the stock markets of the world of from five billion to ten billion dollars. When he approached the august Russian statesman whose help he needed he received at first but scant attention; but he was not to be put off. "I tell you," he cried, "you think your nation's welfare depends upon your Czar or upon your Douma. I tell you, no!—it depends upon the man behind the ticker in Chicago!"

—and then his Highness condescended to take notice.

As the result of the initiative of the King of Italy, thirty-one countries pledged themselves by a convention signed in 1905 to support the Institute by sending an annual delegation to its General Assembly and maintaining permanent experts at Rome, and to contribute their quota toward the expense involved. Later, forty-seven countries signed a treaty without time limit for the formation of the International Institute of Agriculture, the main purpose of which was outlined by Mr. Lubin in the following words:

The chief purpose of the International Institute of Agriculture is to remove the obstacles which now impede the operation of the law of supply and demand. This will be accomplished by the gathering, summarising, and disseminating of information on the world's supply of the staples of agriculture, this information to be timely, available in form, and to be composed mainly of the stock on hand, and the condition of the growing crops. While it is admitted that timely world's summaries of the stock on hand and of the condition of the growing crops form the basis of the world's price, it must also be admitted that faulty information on this head must result in unnecessary fluctuations. And what untold mischief is there not caused by the rapid, violent, and unnecessary fluctuations in the price of the raw material? The contentions, the strikes, the bankruptcies, and the panics,—who can estimate and summarise them into their sum total of injury and suffering? And yet the cause of

the evil is so manifestly clear that there can be no excuse for overlooking it. It is not manipulation, but the present anarchic mode of procedure, which is the cause, a mode of procedure devoid of the authoritative information we should have of the summary of the available supply. What wonder then that advantage is taken of this lack of knowledge by manipulators, when the stakes to be gained are so high? Unnecessary fluctuations in the world's price of the staples of agriculture must not alone work injuriously on the capital and labour of the farm, but also work injuriously on the capital and labour of the factory, for these staples are the raw material of the manufacturer. It must be further admitted that so long as there are a considerable number of important agricultural nations at the present time which keep no tally of the stock on hand, or of the condition of their growing crops, it must, therefore, necessarily render the world's summary defective to a degree which causes unnecessary fluctuations in the world's price. Nor would it remedy matters were the correct world's summary obtained and disseminated by any one nation; for, were such a nation an exporter, its statements would be controverted by the exporting nations. It necessarily follows, therefore, that the information should be gathered and disseminated by an organisation which represents all the nations, and whose reports would be received as authoritative by all the world. This then would do for the things of exchange what gold does for the medium of exchange. It would steady the price by lessening the opportunities of the fluctuations. And it is this which it is proposed shall be done by the International Institute of Agriculture.

A vast number of technical difficulties confronted the experts of the Institute at the outset on their assembling in the late autumn of 1909. The least of these seemed to one member of the Liverpool Corn Exchange almost insurmountable. He voiced the doubt of many when he said:

I do not quite follow Mr. Lubin's plans as to the mode of issue of intelligence, when it comes to that point. It seems to me that the rotation of the globe may create an international difficulty. For, when it is mid-day in Rome, and the moment arrives for publication of the world's information, it is already night in Australia and only daybreak in New York. The United States trader will not agree, I think, to any postponement of publication of American crop news so as to suit the Australians, nor will Melbourne be content to have its results telegraphed to Rome before they can be issued at their place of origin. Perhaps a solution may be found in a plan which takes note of the time variations, and which locates the commercial centres of the world in three or four zones. Europe and Africa form one such zone, with Rome as the obvious centre of operations. The United States and South America are in another zone, while Australia and Japan make a third. When of sufficient importance, India and Persia might constitute a fourth zone. The suggestion is that items of news should be published at once within their own zone of origin, as well as in Rome, which city remains for all other purposes the pivot of operations.

This difficulty was easily surmounted when a mere clerk suggested that weekly bulletins should

be cabled on Saturday afternoons, which would prevent their announcement anywhere before Monday morning. The immense importance of simultaneous announcements to the stock markets of the world will be readily appreciated. Other difficulties were the excessive variety of standards of weights and measures, and of methods of sending out reports in the various countries. It is interesting to Americans to learn that the Institute has accepted the plan of crop-reporting in the American style of the "single numerical statement." The language of the Institute is French. One difficulty has been to provide adequate translations to supply departments of agriculture, national granges, etc., with scientific reports concerning desirable improvements. Europe and especially Germany have been profoundly benefited, for example, by the Raiffeisen system of co-operative banking, by which German peasant farmers do a business of over \$600,000,000 a year. Yet only at this late day, through the International Institute of Agriculture, have the history and the static and dynamic data of this and other systems of rural credit been presented even to economists. Up to the present time the farmers of the United States have scarcely made a beginning in the direction of a practical system of agricultural credit, and they have too often been the prey of money sharks. So important is the matter deemed by the Institute that it has already published much material upon the general

subject that all the world may benefit by the information. Under any one of the loan systems, long familiar in Germany, Mr. Lubin holds that the power of the trusts would be largely abolished, for the farmer, like the business man, would have generous and elastic conditions of credit. "In all the plans for curbing the trusts, it has never been suggested that the most effective way of doing this is to deprive them of the monopoly of handling the products in which they deal," said he, "and this is in effect one of the things that will be accomplished by the co-operative syndicating of the securities which the farmers can offer." From the outset, Germany perceived the extreme value of the Institute's scheme of work and sent distinguished experts to share in its labours.

Mr. Lubin's prime purpose in his stupendous scheme was not so much to keep farmers from being fleeced by "bulls and bears" as to create a family of nations with mutual interests. This deeper purpose, which has led him to give years of toil and many thousands of dollars in perfecting his comprehensive plan, he does not often make explicit, and it is only to those who are privileged to share his confidence that this far-sighted peacemaker reveals the mainspring of his purpose—to beat swords into ploughshares.

The extent to which the world has advanced in its recognition of complex, mutual interests can be realised as perhaps nowhere else in the Central Bureau of International Institutions at Brussels.

As one walks down its long corridors, lined with drawers in filing-cases, and stops anywhere to examine the cards massed in the drawers, giving information of organisations, military, medical, educational, political, commercial, religious, scientific, and artistic, he feels that he is getting a bird's-eye view of the varied activities of the human race. Under the auspices of the Bureau there has been issued a huge book of over thirteen hundred pages wherein one finds tabulated the records of the official and unofficial international associations of the world. Mr. William T. Stead thus graphically described the effect which this ponderous volume made upon his imagination:

When I opened the box and took out the book, I felt as if I had suddenly come into the possession of King Solomon's magic carpet, which enabled me to fly far into the future. It is a fascinating book. When you read its pages you seem to be witnessing the erection of a new world. For here we see the spirit of Polycivilisation brooding upon the formless and anarchic abyss of space, and evolving therefrom the World State of the future. It is a marvellous picture which is thus represented. An enormous multitude of forces are creating a new body in the shape of a highly complex international organisation, and they are informing it with a new soul—the Conscience of Humanity. This is the greatest of all the miracles of our time,—the almost automatic evolution of one harmonious World State out of the multitudinous jarring congeries of national states which constitute

the armed anarchy of this planet. The impulse comes very partially from religion. It does not proceed at all from military conquest. Science and the machine—these are the dominant influences which are unifying mankind. Everywhere and at all times the subtle influence of steam and electricity are at work in their great task of world shrinkage.

As one turns the leaves of this *Annuaire de la Vie Internationale*, he discovers that, of the multitude of international organisations, one hundred and fifty hold regular international congresses, the first of these dating from 1864. The number of savants who attend these conventions is enormous. At the Congress of Applied Chemistry in London in 1909, there were 9000 members. At the Congress of Medicine at Moscow, there were 7000 members. The International Congress of Young Men's Christian Associations represented a membership of over 800,000, divided into nearly 8000 associations. At these congresses, the Brazilian chemist meets the Danish chemist, the Japanese biologist hobnobs with the Russian, the German professor of philology with the English professor; science, a common interest, a common culture break down racial prejudices and transcend imaginary political boundary lines. Where each has something to learn and teach, where all are working for a common end, the problems which form the absorbing interest of the militarists are ignored or brushed aside. In common sympathies and

ambitions the foundation is laid for permanent world peace. The world's wars are chiefly due to misunderstanding. It was an ominous fact that during the Morocco crisis of 1911 the foreign ministers of England, France, and Germany were unacquainted with each other and with each other's countries. The first duty of a European foreign minister, one would say, is to travel and know personally the men with whom he deals, when the prosperity of millions of his fellows is at stake.

The first World's Congress of International Associations was held at Brussels, May 9 to 11, 1910. At this Congress 132 out of a total of some 200 associations related to the Central Bureau movement were represented. It was the first step toward a general co-ordination of all unofficial international activities. At this Congress there were present four Nobel peace laureates, including Auguste Beernaert, who presided over the deliberations. In one of the reports of the proceedings occurs the following definition of internationalism:

Internationalism of interests and efforts is only the continuation of the great movement which has already created in history regionalism and nationalism. Among the independent nations—which ought to survive, as provinces survive within states—there has been progressively developed a vast organisation destined to embrace all states and nationalities.

It is to Senator Henri La Fontaine of Belgium,

President of the International Peace Bureau, with headquarters at Berne, that the world chiefly owes a debt for the laborious compilations and the mass of material which make the Bureau at Brussels an invaluable clearing-house of information for the expert and a powerful factor for the promotion of good-will and justice between nations.

In the marble palace of the Pan-American Union in Washington is splendidly housed an organisation devoted to the development of peace, friendship, and commerce between the twenty-one republics of the western hemisphere. It is the creature of the four International Conferences held in Washington, Mexico, Rio de Janeiro, and Buenos Aires, between 1889 and 1910. This union is thus far a voluntary organisation, existing by common consent and co-operation, which focuses here the various political, social, and commercial interests of one hundred and sixty millions of people who occupy an area three times as great as Europe.

It is difficult for us of English descent, proud of an inheritance of many centuries of parliaments, to realise that the young American republics, which less than a century ago threw off the yoke of Spain, are subjects for very serious consideration. Our solicitude and help in the time of the Holy Alliance have singularly enough not been continued by great commercial interchange or intelligent appreciation. Not until Secretary Root's notable

tour around the southern continent did we open our eyes to realise the potentialities and progress of Latin America. Our press and our business men had grossly neglected it, leaving rich markets for the clever German while we went far over seas and spent hundreds of millions of dollars in Asiatic possessions in hope thereby of winning trade with the impoverished Orient, whereas our trade is in no wise dependent on our owning any land beyond San Francisco. We have entered now upon a new era, and are no longer astounded at pictures of noble edifices in Uruguay or Costa Rica, of miles of shipping and grain elevators in Buenos Aires, and cathedrals and opera-houses that equal any which our rich land can boast. We are beginning to comprehend that revolution is no longer in most southern republics the order of the day, and that for fifteen years, at least two thirds of these republics have had none of any consequence. We have discovered the necessity of sending a different type of American to deal with these more courteous and somewhat suspicious people to the south—drummers who know the language, who carry schedules and send bills of lading in the tongue and coinage of the country, who leave behind them brusqueness and “hustle,” and learn to give credits and have patience. We are now sending consuls who do not disgrace us and are showing ourselves more appreciative and friendly. Not a little of this recent change has been due to the enthusiasm of Mr. John Barrett,

who since 1906 has been Director-General of the Pan-American Union, during which time the correspondence and publications of the Union have increased tenfold. The monthly magazine, published in two editions, one in English for circulation in the United States, the other in Spanish, Portuguese, and French sections for circulation in South America and Europe, is a constant revelation of a new world of marvellous interest to every student of human progress. The Columbus Library, housed in the capacious new building in Washington, comprises 20,000 volumes upon the republics; these, with daily newspapers, monthly reviews, maps, gazettes, and monographs, furnish a mine of information and, together with the constant work of all the officials, serve to create a mighty influence to bring about that mutual understanding which is essential to the justice that produces peace.

The Union has led to the improvement of passenger service in steamship lines to South America, has increased travel, and has started the study in many educational institutions of Spanish and Portuguese and of Latin-American economic, industrial, and political conditions. From time to time special representatives are sent throughout the twenty-one republics to collect the latest information. The magnificent Washington structure, largely the gift of Mr. Andrew Carnegie, is placed in spacious grounds, which are eventually to be transformed into beautiful gardens with

pools of water illumined at night by phosphorescent glow; and, dominating all, irradiated by light, will stand the statue of Universal Peace.

In July, 1911, there was held in London, at the suggestion of Dr. Felix Adler, one of the most remarkable assemblies that ever met in human history, known as the Universal Races Congress. This Congress included representatives of over forty races and nationalities, and was presided over by Lord Weardale. About twelve hundred members, each paying a guinea, attended the eight sessions and brilliant social functions, and each received a copy of the volume of 450 pages on *Inter-Racial Problems* which contained the valuable collection of scientific papers prepared by the invited speakers. German professors and high-bred English women, Americans, and other representatives of the white races sat down to luncheon with men and women of all degrees of colour. Learned Brahmins, an American Indian—a graduate of Dartmouth College—Cambridge professors, London and Paris economists, cultivated negroes from America and South Africa, Turks, Egyptians, Persians, Chinese diplomats, Hungarians, Russians,—men and women from all lands, including one handsome Maori,—here commingled as friends and neighbours, all intent on one great problem—to promote good-will and solve the problems of race intercourse due to man's ignorance and prejudice. The Roosevelt professor at Berlin discussed "Geographic, Political, and

Economic Conditions"; and among other subjects were "Miscegenation," "International Law and Subject Races," "Traffic in Intoxicants and Opium," and various aspects of international, economic, and peace problems. This remarkable gathering is doubtless destined to prove the first of many triennial or quadrennial conferences which will focus the minds of scholars the world over on some of the most difficult problems which tradition and prejudice have rendered still more difficult of solution. It was hoped that one of the first steps in showing how people of culture and goodwill may transcend race prejudice in common intercourse would be the establishment in London, New York, and other great centres of an international hostel or cosmopolitan club, where people of all races, with proper credentials, would be welcomed and where distinguished foreigners would be entertained. Such centres would be potent agencies for bringing home to the representatives of the various peoples their interdependence and for promoting their influential co-operation.

CHAPTER IV

MAKERS OF MILITARISM

"DON'T you think that you put too high a value on human life?" asked a newspaper reporter some years ago, after listening to an address given by the writer. "Only the valuation which the courts of our country give," was the reply, "which makes the murder of even one black baby a capital crime before the law."

As one reads frequently in nearly every newspaper the headline, "War Game," and sees how the ghastly science of killing human beings is treated by the press as if it were football, one is appalled at the effect which the power of suggestion must have over the minds of the youth, whose fathers, twenty-five years ago, knew nothing of "war games" and were not afraid when we had no navy, or but a very small one.

Granted that some slaughter of human beings has been necessary in the past, and that there is still a possibility of our again fighting a foreign foe,—is not the press of the country largely responsible for creating the psychological conditions that breed war and make it alluring, when, instead of as

"war practice" or "war study," they treat the whole thing as a game, or show, or sport? Doubtless the sheriff, who is to execute a murderer, must practise with his gallows to enable him to slip the noose perfectly; but we put no glamour over this, and our children do not play at hangings. But when we prepare to kill *en masse*, and it is not a question of killing a criminal, who is a menace to society, but of killing thousands of men who are patriotically serving their country according to their light, as our soldiers are serving our country, then the spectators are moved to hilarity and amusement; bayonet practice, the stabbing of imaginary heads and breasts and legs with the deadly steel, is surrounded with the glamour of a game.

Of late the interest in target practice is increased by firing at sham figures of men with movable limbs like jumping-jacks. In England the power of suggestion is adduced by one writer as having great results in the Aldershot practice manœuvres when the combatants referred to each other as Germans. "Is n't that rather an ill-considered custom?" an officer was asked. "Is n't it calculated to stir up bad blood and encourage hatred?" "I don't know as to that," he replied, "but it certainly is calculated to get the keenest sort of work out of them. They 're lazy beggars unless we set 'em on the Germans; then you should see 'em."

During the last sixty years we have fought with a foreign power only six months. We have never been attacked by any foreign power since we

became a republic, as has previously been said, and in every one of our three wars we made the first attack. There is no reason to suppose that future history will reverse the past, or, now that we have endless methods of defence other than powder and dynamite, that we shall ever be attacked. What is the excuse altogether for this sudden, extravagant devotion to military manoeuvres, so vastly greater than anything we saw a few years ago? Never were we so safe, so able to preserve ourselves from danger by arbitration, neutralisation, and the mighty power of non-intercourse. Doubtless our soldiers must practise. But let their work be called practice, not a game, or play, or sport, which by big headlines and journalistic art is forced upon the attention of the public as a matter of high importance. Few of the populace have imagination enough to realise what all this means, and few have any perception of relative values.

It is salutary to be reminded in 1912 of the venom and hysteria of the makers of militarism seventeen years ago in their suspicions of Great Britain, as unfounded then as are their present accusations against another nation. Some of the men whose words here follow must in later and cooler moments be themselves startled at the record. Said Senator Lodge in 1895:

The gold monometallic policy of Great Britain is I believe the great enemy of good business through-

out the world at this moment; therefore, it seems to me, if there is any way in which we can strike England's trade or her moneyed interest, it is our clear policy to do so in the interest of silver.

It is interesting to observe, as Norman Angell has pointed out, that at that moment England was buying more of us than all other countries combined. Senator Lodge's advice to cripple her as an economic factor in the world would have destroyed half our foreign market. Said Senator Hawley:

In every emergency with which the United States has been confronted, the British government has been our enemy. She is pushing us on every side now. She is going to straddle the Nicaragua Canal and to grab the Alaska gold fields. . . . *I tell you that we must be ready to fight.*

"Grant, Lord, that we may be quick to resent insults," was the prayer of the chaplain of the Senate, as reported, the morning after the Venezuelan message. "War with England!—every good American should lie awake nights praying for it," wrote Ambrose Bierce in the San Francisco *Examiner*. "I think," said Senator John B. Wilson, "we should annex, in some way or other, all the countries on this hemisphere." "War is a good thing," said Senator Frye; "I should annex Cuba by conquest simply because we want it." Theodore Roosevelt, who undoubtedly is

more than any other man responsible for the increase of militarism in the United States, expounded his philosophy as follows:

We must play a great part in the world, and especially perform those deeds of blood and valour which above everything else bring national renown. The navy and army are the sword and shield which this nation must carry. We do not admire the man of timid peace. By war alone can we acquire those virile qualities necessary to win in the stern strife of actual life.¹

Upon the writer of newspaper headlines and editorials there is a greater moral responsibility than upon the average citizen. Let him read and reflect upon these words of that noble patriot, John Hay:

If the press of the world would adopt and persist in the high resolve that war should be no more, the clang of arms would cease from the rising of the sun to its going down, and we should fancy that at last our ears, no longer stunned by the din of battle, might hear the morning stars singing together and all the sons of God shouting for joy.

Said the late lamented Justice Brewer:

While I have an abiding faith that the tendency of American thought and purpose will ere long be reversed, no one can be blind to the fact that there is a

¹ The [above quotations are taken from Norman Angell's *Patriotism Under Three Flags*.

persistent effort to make of this a great military nation. From the football field to the ironclad, from the athlete to the admiral, the thought and the talk is fight. The cry is fight fair, but fight. The capital city has a different aspect from that which it had a few years ago. Brass buttons and epaulets are filling the eyes. Our newspapers are eulogising the magnificence of our fleet, and army, and the thought of the nation is largely in the direction of naval and military advance. Science is giving its attention to the discovery and manufacture of more instruments of death, and we are rapidly drifting into an admiration for the "pride, pomp, and circumstance of glorious war." At the First Hague Conference we were among those nations calling for a limitation of armament. Now, instead of leading in that direction, we are constantly increasing our armament and point with pride to the fact that our naval fighting strength surpasses that of every other nation excepting Great Britain. How has this been brought about? According to circulars issued by the departments in November, 1908, the number of officers on the active list residing in the District of Columbia was 237; on the retired list, 166. The number of officers on the active list in the navy and marine corps was 216; on the retired list, 108. In other words, the number of military and naval officers on the active and retired lists then in the District of Columbia was 727. Most of these had their families with them. In addition, there were a number of families of deceased officers. Do you wonder that these, connected as they are with the military and naval forces, are gradually transforming the capital of the country into a military and naval centre, and

that their influence is constantly pressing upon Congress for continued development and increased expenditures in military and naval lines? Contrast this with the judicial service. The number of federal judges in the District of Columbia and in all the States of the Union put together was then only 138, less than twenty per cent of the military and naval officials gathered in the capital city. And yet we have a constant complaint of tardiness in judicial proceedings. Do you wonder that the army and navy make the great American display in all the receptions at the White House or that the officials who manage such receptions appear in military or naval uniform? And this in face of the fact that all the leaders in the national life have been proclaiming their longing for universal peace.

The recent protest that there is "no growth of military spirit in our country" is idle, when we see that in thirty years there has been an increase of nearly thirty times the space given to military news in our press and in the public thought. Ten years ago a demand to have all our public-school boys taught rifle-shooting as a means of national defence would have been hooted at. To-day it is tolerated, and in some quarters accepted; and General Leonard Wood's hysterical demand for an army of 450 000 men finds timid taxpayers who applaud.

The making of armaments and battleships is one of the most profitable industries on earth. One may use old reapers, old sewing-machines, almost

any old machine, except an old gun or battleship. A new invention any day may make all burnished arms simply material for the scrap-heap. We have recently seen a whole town which had large ship-building interests turn out *en masse* to welcome a retired admiral who had secured for it a ten or twelve million dollar order for a dreadnaught. Church bells rang, young men in the Young Men's Christian Association burned red fire, in a regular Roman triumph in honour of this "benefactor."

It is part of the business of the promoters of militarism to deceive a credulous public that has not read history. As regularly as the month for naval appropriations arrives, we are infected with Japanophobia and read columns about the crafty Oriental, the Yellow Peril, and our "absolute unpreparedness" to cope with any one of a half dozen nations that might land one or two hundred thousand soldiers upon our coasts. Pusillanimity and craven fear are dubbed "prudence" and "timely caution." A nation that for many decades had a tiny navy and a large merchant marine is transformed into a nation without a merchant marine but with a navy that ranks second in the world; yet it indulges periodically in fits of panic and hysteria about hypothetical enemies. No attention is given by our ardent militarist to probabilities, but his eye is focused upon possibilities. His illusions and vagaries would be comic were it not such a tragic fact that he has the ear of an uninformed and timid popu-

lace, which learns its history from headlines, its philosophy from tea-table chatter, and its economics from tradition.

The world would have had many fewer wars, had warriors attended strictly to the technicalities of their profession and not attempted to meddle or advise in matters in which they are conspicuously untrained. A tailor may make excellent coats, but it is not his function to decide how many coats a customer shall have, nor when he shall wear them. Neither should the naval expert decide how many battleships we need. He does not know our needs. He knows only how our fleet compares with others, and that he wants a job. The peace of the world depends on confidence, not on the number of guns. The men who produce confidence without guns, like that which exists between Canada and the United States, know how to deal with human nature. Men whose business it is to study the science of killing other men at a distance of four to twenty miles are not the ones to discuss fundamental issues which involve the need or right of killing. To understand explosives is one thing; to understand racial and economic tendencies and to make friends instead of enemies is quite another thing. The business man, the economist, and statesman should know about these things; the professional soldier as such is not an expert in them, which is certainly no discredit to him unless he attempts to talk as if he were. Millions have perished because of his misinterpreting and magni-

fying his office and scaring multitudes with *ifs*. His incredulity about the reasonable new means of preventing war, now available for the first time, is like that of all of us a dozen years ago about scientific management in industry. The ordinary militarist seems to recognise the power of these new forces as little as the express companies appreciate the advantages of the parcels post. All his demands for a huge increase of the army or navy are based on *ifs*, and some of these are about as likely probabilities as that the Pope will turn Methodist, or that the Czar will proclaim a republic. *If* Germany should encroach on South America, as she has never yet done; *if* the Japanese should try to force their emigration upon us, as they have not done and are never likely to; *if* China should become as warlike as she has previously been peaceful; *if* when our fleet was at Terra del Fuego all the navies of the world had combined to attack us; *if* the great new provision of arbitration treaties and the Hague Court is calculated to promote war instead of peace, etc.—thus the *ifs* of these visionaries multiply.

Our alarmists have far less excuse than some Mexican jingo would have who, looking to our country, which once defeated him, should labour night and day to stir up enmity against us. What might he not truthfully allege as to our recklessness regarding life, our appalling list of homicides and lynchings, and Mr. Roosevelt's declaration that in recent years more official corruption had been dis-

closed than in the previous century? How easy to show to simple-minded Mexicans what our greed and graft and ambition might lead us to do in bombarding their helpless coast towns and seizing their unprotected railroads and mines! How dangerous to let a day pass without preparing for a colossal foe that at a word of friction might close up their ports and bring ruin and desolation on the innocent! Let them waste no money on schools or parks or public buildings while the very life of the country stands thus exposed to that greedy monster to the north!

There are few more powerful and wealthy forces in the promotion of militarism than the Navy Leagues of Germany and the United States. Their purpose is to maintain an "adequate" navy, which is always interpreted by them as meaning the largest one possible, and to impress an impressionable public with the danger of invasion and the necessity of being "prepared," for every contingency, however remote. The American League appears to have sections or branches in every great centre; wherever five Americans are gathered together abroad it aims to have a branch; and there are even branches in some of the universities. Not content with leaving Congress and the Navy Department to push the claims of the navy, the League is so under the spell of the great illusion of the efficacy of a huge navy to benefit our country that it deems it a work of patriotism to demand appropriations which would swell the seventy per

cent of our national income already being expended for past and future war. The League, founded in 1902, aims to have a million members, in emulation of the German League. It cites with approval the methods of the latter: its exhibition of model battleships in all inland towns; its prizes given in the public schools for the best essays on naval subjects—scarfpins, brooches, rings, and other jewelry designed by the League; and the employment of a body of lecturers to go through Germany giving in schools and halls kinetoscope exhibitions with explanations about life in the navy. It claims that "all international efforts have failed to limit armaments among the leading powers." How little this signifies appears from the fact that it was only in 1899 that the first attempt was made to establish a recognised substitute for war. The advance made in substituting the system of law for the system of war since then has been greater than in all previous history. These legal preliminaries were necessary before the solution of the very difficult and technical problems involved in the equal mutual limitation of armaments could be attempted.

It is important to remember that the following resolution was adopted by both branches of Congress in June, 1910:

Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that a commission of five members be

appointed by the President of the United States to consider the expediency of utilising existing international agencies for the purpose of limiting the armaments of the nations of the world by international agreement, and of constituting the combined navies of the world an international force for the preservation of universal peace, and to consider and report upon any other means to diminish the expenditures of government for military purposes and to lessen the probabilities of war.

But the American Navy League itself is perhaps chiefly responsible for the fact that our strong, self-contained, and well-protected republic has not the courage to take the lead in the limitation of its own navy and to invite others to follow suit. Our timidity and continued increase have furnished the explicit argument for increase by other nations, and our huge navy, so much larger than our needs, has become an obstacle to the world's progress. "Battleships are cheaper than battles" is the sophistical alternative presented by the League's motto. "Statesmanship is cheaper and more efficacious than battleship" is the proper retort of the practical business man to-day, who knows why Germany and France did not range their battleships against each other in the summer of 1911. This statesmanship is the function of the banker and economist as well as of the legislator who votes appropriations.

The Navy League, in the programme of its last convention, to justify its claims, quotes without

context the words of Jesus, "I came not to send peace, but a sword." That sword of the spirit which made his teaching dirempt families, setting "a man at variance against his father and the daughter against her mother," it is needless to say, has as little to do with the weapons for which the Navy League is clamouring as Paul's "whole armour of God" has to do with armour-plate from Pittsburg mills.

The League declares itself to be based on the belief that if we are strong no one will attack us, and upon the "knowledge that we will never unjustly attack others." This latter assumption of our own just purposes is of course ridiculed by other nations with which we might have trouble. Possibly, however, it would not be so confidently asserted by the League if for the effusive and grandiloquent words in the building at West Point devoted to memorials of the Mexican War were substituted those words of General Grant, who fought in that same war: "For myself, I was bitterly opposed to the measure, and to this day regard the war which resulted as one of the most unjust wars ever waged by a stronger against a weaker people." When one remembers that, as has previously been said, from 1872 to 1898 we were wholly "unprepared," with a tiny navy scarcely larger than China's, and that this was also our condition for thirty years before the Civil War, one sees why it was that we were so flouted, imposed on, and abused by the whole world

during that period of humiliation! The explanation is easy. During these disgraceful years, when we were cowering in terror, we had no Navy League!

CHAPTER V

THE NAVY AS "INSURANCE"

THE Secretary of the Navy has recently stated that our navy is the "cheapest insurance" on our national wealth. Now "insurance" involves payment to make good a loss, which is something that navies never make; the term is misleading. If, however, we substitute the word "protection," which is probably what was meant, the Secretary's argument as to the cost of the navy relative to the wealth it protects is even more misleading. Taking the valuation of the total wealth of the country, he shows an average annual expenditure of only \$.0012 on the dollar for the support of the navy. It is an ingenious statement, literally correct, but conveying a wholly false impression. It leaves the average reader, who knows nothing further on the subject, with the comfortable assumption that we are receiving an enormous degree of protection for a trifling sum. Naturally our annual outgo for the navy should be compared with our annual income, not with the total capital of the country.

The estimate of wealth of course includes all our

vast territory—forests, Dakota wheat fields, Pennsylvania oil-wells, Chicago sky-scrapers, Colorado silver mines, our lake shipping, and all wealth out of reach of an enemy's guns fired at sea. It implies also that all the seaboard wealth is exposed to bombardment. But at the Hague Conference, "the bombardment of undefended ports, towns, villages, dwellings, or buildings" was prohibited by unanimous vote. To-day, if an enemy's fleet were to approach our shores, the seaside cottagers need have no alarm, unless they were close to fortified places and had not availed themselves of the legal right to plant mines to prevent landing of troops.

Looking at the matter fairly, then, we perceive that, instead of comparing the cost of protection given by the navy to the colossal wealth of our wide domains, we should compare it merely with the fortified and therefore exposed points on the coasts, all of which compose but a small fraction of the total wealth. This fraction is all that a navy can protect from attack; for surely nobody imagines an invading force advancing with impunity from the coast to Chicago.

The Secretary's figures express the average cost of the navy through all our history as related to present wealth. The thoughtless reader needs to be reminded that the expense of the navy has recently increased enormously—the cost in the last twenty-five years having advanced six hundred per cent. In 1911 alone we spent about one hundred and twenty times as much as the average

annual expenditure for the navy during the eight years of Washington's administration. The average, therefore, during all our history, which is what the Secretary presents, is totally different from the average of the last five years. The Secretary would produce a very different impression if he stated some equally accurate and far more pertinent figures than those of the ratio of .0012 to \$1, viz., that we spend half as much on our navy, which is built to fight enemies that do not yet exist, as we are spending every year upon tuition in the public schools of the whole country, which defend us from the very real enemies of illiteracy, disease, anarchy, and poverty. When we realise that the average family income in America is probably little more than \$500, and our taxation for past and future war, including pensions, is over \$21 per family, the real situation is more clearly seen.

The Secretary of the Navy further declared:

The money expended upon our battleships and cruisers has not been an economic loss. . . . Previous to the building of the "white squadron" no steel plate had been manufactured in this country. In 1880, before the navy had authorised ships requiring steel of domestic manufacture, there were 140,000 wage-earners in the iron and steel trades, earning \$55,000,000 in wages and turning out products worth \$296,500,000. Since the navy has been placed on a modern basis and has reached the rank of second or third in the navies of the world, we find 242,740 wage-

earners in the steel and iron industry, earning in a year \$141,439,000 and producing iron and steel worth \$905,000,000. The encouragement given to this industry by the construction of the new navy had a decided influence in bringing about these substantial results, and therefore I claim that the money expended on battleships and cruisers has not been thrown away as the peace societies and some of the worthy clergy who have been opposing the increase in the navy and the building of battleships would have you believe.

The thoughtless reader is here misled by the hoary fallacy, which has been the pretext for endless folly and extravagance, that, no matter how money is spent, if it is kept in circulation and gives employment it is a godsend. Money circulates at the gambling tables at Monte Carlo, yet no more wealth is created. Robbing Peter to pay Paul does not enrich the community. The point for the taxpayer to consider is that money put into the employment of men in making armaments cannot be put into the making of sorely needed railroads, engines, and machinery, into steel bridges and steel buildings and farming tools, as it might be if left in the pockets of the taxpayers, who would then be free to spend it for such constructive purposes. In either case an equal number of men would be employed, if not all in this particular industry of steel, in some other equally well paid industry. Money does not lie idle. As well argue for the trade in whiskey, indecent literature, and

vulgar moving-pictures, for necromancy and prize-fights, that they have excuse because they circulate money and give employment, as to make this a reason for the increase of armaments in the face of only hypothetical danger.

The Secretary aroused enthusiasm when he declared that eight more battleships would have prevented the Spanish-American War, which, he said, cost the country \$507,000,000 in immediate outlay, and thus far has cost \$20,000,000 in pensions, a sum which will grow enormously as the years pass. Had the eight battleships been built [declared the Secretary], and the navy thus been able to prevent the war with Spain, it would not have been given credit for so doing by those who are opposed to the upbuilding of our navy—but the fact remains. Their cry is that they do not believe there will ever be a war. One should never commit the error of placing one's personal belief above the lessons of history and experience. To be strong, armed for war, is a guarantee for peace; to be rich but weak is to invite aggression.

The presence of eight more battleships might possibly have so overawed Spain that she would not have endeavoured to save her face; but that is guesswork. Many other things than more battleships might have prevented that needless war. In an article entitled, "Charles Sumner's More Excellent Way," the present managing director of the World Peace Foundation some years ago imagined the successor of Sumner in the Sen-

ate uttering words like these in that critical spring of 1898:

We are clearly drifting towards a war with Spain in behalf of Cuba. In a month, unless we show wisdom greater than the past has shown, we shall be in the midst of war. That war will cost us \$300,000,000. Is there not a better way of spending \$300,000,000? Is there not a better way of achieving what we aim at,—the freedom, good government, and development of Cuba? I propose that we submit to Cuba and to Spain this offer and request: Let us establish at Havana a university as well equipped as Harvard University, with an endowment of \$10,000,000, free to every young man and woman of Cuba, with the best professors who can be secured from America and Spain and England and France and Germany. Let us establish at Santiago and Matanzas and Puerto Principe colleges like Amherst and Williams, with a total endowment of \$10,000,000; and in each of the twenty largest towns a high school or academy, at a cost of \$10,000,000. Let us devote \$20,000,000—\$1,000,000 a year for twenty years—to the thorough planting in Cuba of our American common-school system; \$10,000,000 to the promotion of a system of free public libraries, making books as accessible and common in each Cuban town and village as in Barnstable or Berkshire; and \$6,000,000 for the maintenance in each of the six provinces of a newspaper conducted by the best men who can be enlisted in the service, bringing all Cuban men and women into touch with all the world, giving them those things which will feed them, and not giving them those things

which would poison them. Let us build a Cuban Central Railroad through the whole length of the island, from Mantua to Maysi; and let us devote the balance of \$100,000,000 to the scientific organisation, by proper bureaus, of Cuban agriculture, industry, and commerce. Let there be a truce for ten years, till these things are done and begin to show their fruits, and then let the representatives of the United States and Spain meet at Havana to settle the "Cuban question" as it then exists. This, fellow-citizens of America, seems to me worth trying. If it succeeds, we should at least have saved \$200,000,000; and it would be, I think, a kind of success more pregnant with good for Cuba and Spain and America and humanity than the success which we may be celebrating next September. I spent the still hours of last night, leaving all this hurly-burly, reading Charles Sumner's solemn words on "The True Grandeur of Nations"; and his message has commanded me to submit this proposition to you at this hour. There are those of you who will laugh and scoff, and say the thought is all chimerical, vicious, and fallacious; but I say unto you, in the name of the God of our fathers, that with those of you who do not think so lies the hope of the world. I say that the kingdom of God can come in this world, that peace and justice and fraternity can come among men, that democracy itself has a safe future, only as some elect people, with sublime abandon, in a great opportunity does this thing,—taking, in this world of undeniable and conflicting risks, the heroic risk,—the risk which alone has in it hope for the world and relish of salvation. And our opportunity is now.

Does this seem impossible idealism? Then let us imagine a business-like proposition of a loan from us, accompanied by a ten years' truce, and expert control of customs. When, as before stated, our then Minister to Spain has expressed the opinion that if we had waited forty-eight hours war would probably have been prevented, it is easy to see that in more ways than one relief might have come to starving reconcentrados, and justice in the end have been done. As the result of our actual action, after our declaration of war no food nor medicine was allowed to be landed to relieve the very victims for whom we had taken up arms.

The advocates of the navy as a cheap insurance take no cognisance of the fact that, as has been said, the bombardment of unfortified places on our long coast line is expressly prohibited by the Hague Conventions. They ignore the enormous possibilities of peace budgets to be used in allaying friction at the start, the threat of non-intercourse as an immense power of coercion, and the fact that the great powers of the world with whom we chiefly deal are ready to *arbitrate every question that can arise between them and us, irrespective of its touching matters of vital interest and honour*. They ignore the new fact that France, England, and, in all probability, Germany are ready to join with us in instituting "as occasion arises," "a Joint High Commission of Inquiry, to which upon the request of either party shall be referred for impartial and

conscientious investigation any controversy between the parties" that is based on "a claim of right made by one against the other," or any other controversy not coming under that head, "provided, however, that such reference may be postponed until the expiration of one year after the date of the formal request therefor, in order to afford an opportunity for diplomatic discussion and adjustment of the questions in controversy, if either party desires such postponement."

It would seem that only wilful blindness to these existing safeguards and morbid fear of non-existent foes could permit the Secretary of the Navy to assert:

We have an enormous extent of coast line; we have Alaska, Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines; and we have the obligation to guard and protect Cuba and maintain her neutrality. To perform these obligations satisfactorily we must have a strong sea-going fleet. The only sure defence of the country and the only assurance for safety is for the fleet to be able to seek out its enemy on the high seas and to cripple or destroy it. It does not suffice simply to drive the enemy a few miles away from our coast and then await the uncertainty of another attack; safety can only be assured by the destruction of the enemy's fleet.

Peace advocates are often assumed to urge disarmament. None but impracticable extremists desire to take a third step before they have taken

the first, and no men of prominence in the peace movement belong to this class. Disarmament must be preceded by reduction of armaments. Reduction of armaments must be preceded by limitation of armaments. Were all nations subject to equal dangers, there might be some excuse for the common claim that no beginning can be made in limitation of armaments until it is done simultaneously by all. But the dangers that threaten other nations are as ten to one compared with ours. We are self-sustaining and not, like England, dependent on the outside world for food. We have no great merchant marine like England's and Germany's to protect. Russia's constant efforts to reach an ice-free port, Austria-Hungary's racial problems, Turkey's domestic difficulties, Italy's impoverishment through her brigandage in Tripoli—all these causes and a score more make Europe tremble. But why should they alarm us—the best protected people upon earth? As well ask solidly built Paris to emulate Chicago in its number of fire-engines as to demand that we shall gauge our navy by the navies of the Old World. The one nation which can afford to call a halt in the increase of armaments, whether other nations follow suit or not, is our own. So far from losing prestige, the United States would gain it by such leadership, taken voluntarily because she knew herself to be so safe and strong that she refused longer to tax herself unduly through stupid, craven fear. The Kentucky "moonshiner" with a "peace-

maker" in his hip pocket is afraid. The gentleman who walks down Pennsylvania Avenue without one is not afraid.

Our disgraceful, unwonted fear, so different from our calm courage of thirty years ago, so far as it is spurious, is only the simulated fear of certain vested interests. So far as it is genuine, it is due to poisonous suggestions of a yellow press and of certain men trained only in the technique of war, who could command no influence were it not for an uninformed and credulous populace.

CHAPTER VI

SOME FALLACIES OF ADMIRAL MAHAN'S

A THOUSAND women in their clubs throughout the country vehemently discuss the ethics involved in giving an overdose of chloral to shorten the death agonies of one's best beloved. A thousand men sign a petition to abolish the execution of convicted murderers. Why is it that perhaps not a hundred in either thousand are making practical and earnest effort to end the killing of myriads of able-bodied, innocent men in war?

There are several reasons for this paradox. The power to put one's self in the other fellow's place, to read statistics with the illumination of imagination and sympathy, is less developed at school than the power to recite exceptions to the rule governing the dative case. A mangled dog in sight compels more tears than the thought of twenty thousand mangled men in Manchuria. Moreover, we are under the obsession of the tradition that the military expert must inevitably best understand the problem of national defence, and that the latter implies armaments solely. When,

therefore, a distinguished naval expert and exemplary Christian gentleman discourses on this theme and tells us that war is inevitable, the layman is overawed and dumb. How should one who knows nothing of battleships or lyddite shells presume to talk on national defence?

Because national defence depends on many other things than armies and navies; because the military man, with his specialised training, is the very last man to be aware of these, and the layman—the tourist, merchant, or diplomat—who has come into contact with other nations in normal relations may know many things about national defence that the man who studies life in abnormal conditions of war does not perceive.

Said a retired United States rear-admiral during the Boer War: "I tell you what England ought to do. She ought to whip France." "What, now, when her hands are tied in South Africa?" exclaimed his friend aghast. "Yes, yes; it would do good and clear the air," was the testy response. "But do you mean to have her go to war about nothing?" "Yes, yes; she could do it and clear the air." Ability to manage a squadron implies little knowledge of statesmanship or international ethics; although, of course, the above gross instance was exceptional and would be as readily condemned by Admiral Mahan as by a Quaker.

But Admiral Mahan's misconceptions and errors regarding the aims and arguments of the new peace party are typical and therefore important

to analyse. First, he darkens understanding by defining war to suit his own fancy and uses the term indiscriminately to cover the literal and figurative use of the word as well as civil war, international war, past war, and future war. All conflict he considers war, saying: "All organised force is by degree war." It should be clearly understood that the peace party opposes only organised, deliberate killing of human beings; its members themselves often share in righteous and necessary conflicts which do not involve the deliberate killing of innocent men. Many ludicrous instances of addled ideas on this subject might be adduced to show the danger in the thoughtless use of terms which confound war with all forms of force. In a certain city the window of a church bookshop was filled with gay, alluring juvenile books on war. A press comment on the incongruity of such a spectacle instantly elicited a silent answer (?) to the protest: a large picture of Jesus overturning the tables of the money-changers was placed beside the books! As if the Founder of our religion would sanction a father's killing his son just because he was known to have chastised him!

A naive newspaper reporter once assumed that my objection to international war would involve condemnation of football; and another youth based his supposed disagreement from my position upon his having been obliged to threaten to knock down an insulting companion if he repeated his

insult. "But you would not kill him, would you?" I inquired. "Of course not," was his horrified response. "But I was talking about killing," I rejoined. "Oh, is that the point? Killing? Yes, yes, I see," was his relieved reply

The muddle-headedness which discerns only a difference in degree and not in kind between organised killing and an organised boycott, or the wholesome thrashing of a schoolyard bully, or such war of words as was waged by the non-resistant, William Lloyd Garrison, seems to be a weakness of many religious journals as well as of military men. The constant assumption that those who condemn future international war are spineless weaklings, devoid of patriotism and the spirit of struggle and adventure, is due to precisely this careless confounding of a form of contest—war—with those manifold other forms of contest in which all brave men should take a valiant part.

Secondly, Admiral Mahan's classing of international war with all other forms of strife leads to his conceiving it impossible to end any one form of violence until all are ended. The cause of universal peace he holds is "nothing more than the cause of universal education." The abolitionists of war are in a measure to blame for the common confusion of thought thus evinced. At the National Peace Congresses, I do not recall a speaker who called attention to the sharp distinction to be drawn between international war, which can be ended by proper organisation, and civil war,

lynchings, murder, which cannot be thus ended. Only a leaflet distributed once by a committee made it clear that these are in another category from international war. The failure to make this plain distinction is largely responsible for the widespread assumption that peace advocates are attempting the impossible or what is possible only in the millennium. If international war could end only when other forms of violence cease, the new peace party, which is animated by the hope of ending it within a century, would indeed be a throng of dreamers and deserving of the amused contempt they so often have received. It is precisely because the end of international war does not require the general education of the world, but only the active co-operation of a slight fraction of the most intelligent, that it may be accomplished a thousand years before other forms of violence have wholly disappeared and before licentiousness, corruption, greed, intemperance, all deeply rooted in existing industrial and social conditions, can be abolished.

The few who will accomplish this, supported by the toiling masses who feel most heavily war's burdens, are editors, parliamentarians, captains of industry and labour, teachers and preachers in five or six of the great nations of the world—one or two million persons all told. To achieve international peace, the bulk of the fifteen hundred million people of the globe are negligible. Let the leading nations begin disarmament, and all others

will be only too glad to follow their leadership. China's 400,000,000 will be only too thankful to save their taxes for constructive purposes when relieved of the menace of the great powers. Neither Hague Conferences nor Hague Courts can prevent or settle civil strife. Theoretically that may break out indefinitely, though practically it would be far less frequent as international war ceased, and despotism disappeared.

Eliminate from consideration our two civil wars—the Revolution and the Rebellion—and the consideration of our own problems becomes much easier and the objector is more readily answered. We are seen to have had no wars since the Revolution except those of our own making. The Mexican War was fought primarily in the interest of slavery, and many are justified in the conclusion that, had it not been for yellow journalism and the blowing up of the *Maine* from some still unknown cause, we might by other methods have relieved Cuba without war and the subsequent entanglements in the East. In regard to our wars with foreign powers, which wars, during over ninety years, have lasted only two and a half years and have involved no invasion of our territory, there is serious difference of opinion as to their excuse. The consideration of war problems is greatly simplified when clear definitions remove the fog which vague and varied use of terms by even such masters of English as Admiral Mahan throw around the difficult subject. When it is seen that abolitionists of war

share the general reverence for the heroes of Bunker Hill and Gettysburg and in general are wasting little time in condemning wars which took place before substitutes for war were provided, much of the hostile criticism towards their efforts is shown to be irrelevant.

Admiral Mahan's reference to "the moral elevation which comes to every citizen in the membership of a great empire" ignores the fact that membership in the Chinese Republic or Russian Empire means far less to the citizen and to the respect which the world renders him than citizenship in the educated, thrifty little states of Holland, Switzerland, or Denmark. Norman Angell has quoted a beggar watching the Coronation procession of colonial and exotic warriors as saying:

I own India, Africa, and the Antipodes, the island of the tropic seas, the snows of the north, the jungles of far continents, and I am starving for a crust of bread. I rule all the black millions from which these legions have been drawn; my word is law in half a world, and yesterday a negro savage turned from my rags in disgust when I cringed before him for alms.

Admiral Mahan derides the efficacy of organisation as a promoter of peace because according to him human nature is not likely to change much for many a century. He evidently shares the feeling of the average sceptic who says to the peace advocates:

Your theories are admirable and would work splendidly if it were not for one thing that you doctrinaires always forget, and that is human nature. This is a wicked world, and Belgians abusing natives on the Congo, or men in Georgia and Pennsylvania burning human beings at the stake, or anarchists in Kentucky or Colorado, or deceitful Russians are not yet quite ready to be left to moral suasion. So long as we have cruelty and deviltry, no milk-and-water policy will do. When we abolish militia and police and go to bed with unlocked doors and trust our lives to our own citizens, then we will abolish army and navy and trust ourselves unprotected to the mercies of strangers,—and, mind you, not before that.

This retort sounds smart and plausible. Ninety-nine soldiers out of a hundred, nine lawyers out of ten, accept it without question; yet therein lies a dangerous fallacy. Admiral Mahan writes: "There are no short cuts by which men may be made peaceful. If the world could have been saved by an organisation, it would have been saved a thousand years ago by the Christian Church." The fallacy here is in confounding states with individuals. In 1787, less than one hundred men worked out in our Constitutional Convention the method which has prevented war between any two of our own States ever since. In like manner, a comparatively few even of the one or two millions above mentioned will work out the methods of preventing war between any two nations.

All this involves no more change of human

nature than that which has made a strong, united Germany out of a score or more of separate units within a generation; it involves no better human nature than that which exists in our own country without war between one State and another, although we are pre-eminent in homicides and lynching within our States. The common assumption that industrial disputes must end before we can hope to settle international quarrels with peace and justice is based on a false assumption. As well might one conclude that permanent peace could not be secured between the State of Kentucky and the State of Tennessee so long as "night riders," lynchings, and homicides are so prevalent within those States.

Human nature doubtless is improving, and improving faster than fruits and flowers under the magic hand of Luther Burbank; the marvellous changes wrought in hostile cannibal tribes bear evidence; but it is organisation, not improved human nature, which prevents such old-time wars as were carried on between Italian cities in the days of Dante and Saint Francis. The Christ of the Andes, which commemorates the pledge of eternal peace between Chili and Argentina made when they escaped imminent war by arbitration, is one of many refutations of Admiral Mahan's statements, so far as governments are concerned. This does not mean that individuals of the two nations will never commit murder, nor that they have not latent the possibility of fiendish conduct

upon sufficient provocation. Organisation removes the provocation between states, and leaves evil possibilities deeply latent, never to be realised. The reason why most Americans are not throwing bombs at officials, like oppressed and maddened Russian revolutionists, is because their innate deviltry has no occasion to develop in that direction. It goes without saying that no loose organisation of believers like the "Christian Church" can ever directly remove the tariff walls and the political and economic obstructions which create hostility; organisation with constitutions and treaties can alone effect this.

The United States Supreme Court was the shortest cut to peace that the world ever saw, and, though it could not prevent rebellion of one half the nation against the Federal Government, it has prevented a dozen interstate conflicts. Virginia and West Virginia have recently had a suit over a question involving \$15,000,000, which was settled without strife or ill feeling, and the majority of citizens in both States hardly knew of the strife's existence. Much smaller differences have repeatedly led to wars between European countries. The average state or nation, much more than the average man, keeps the peace when this is made easy. International organisation of self-governing peoples is the short cut to international peace.

A method of securing a short cut to peace after war has begun would be the previous prohibition of foreign war loans. When guns sent by a neu-

tral nation are counted contraband of war if captured on the high seas, why should not money for the purchase of guns likewise be counted contraband, and loans be prohibited? Whether a European nation dares go to war or not depends very largely upon the good-will of the Rothschilds and the great money-lenders. Could such loans not be negotiated, some wars would never be begun and all would have but brief duration. This argument was strongly urged by Richard Cobden a half century ago, and has been emphasised in our time by Hon. Oscar S. Straus, Hon. William J. Bryan, and eminent New York bankers. Said Mr. James Speyer at the Baltimore Peace Congress:

We find to-day in Europe that in times of peace certain governments will not allow their bankers to take and place foreign loans in the home market unless the purposes for which the loan is to be used are known and approved, and at least part of the proceeds are used by the borrowing nation for expenditures in such home markets for the benefit of the lending nation. I do not believe that it is generally known in this country to what extent such supervision by the French and German governments, for instance, goes; and as illustration I would like to cite from memory what happened last year when the Young Turk party wanted to place abroad a loan of the Ottoman Empire. They went to Paris as the cheapest money market; but when they applied to France, the French government, which supervises the listing or official quotation

of securities on the Paris Bourse, wanted to know for what purpose the loan was to be raised, and if ships, etc., were to be bought from the lending nation. The Turkish finance minister did not want to submit to any conditions, and, according to the newspapers, negotiations were begun with a prominent English financier, who seemed to be willing to make the loan. The French government called the attention of the British government to the so-called *entente cordiale* between France and England, and intimated in a more or less direct way that they would consider English bankers making a loan which France had declined as a rather unfriendly act. The English government thereupon notified the financier and English banks generally that they would not like the loan to Turkey made by them, and it was not made by them. The Turkish government finally obtained the loan from Germany and Austria on terms satisfactory to the governments of those nations. Now, if such supervision and control of the bankers already exists in time of peace, it does not seem a wild flight of imagination to suggest that the Great Powers might agree to exercise such control in times of war between third parties and to maintain in future what, for want of a better term, might be called "financial neutrality." In case two nations went to war without first submitting their grievances and differences to arbitration or judicial settlement at The Hague, why should the other neutral Powers not bind themselves not to assist either of the belligerents financially, but to see to it that real neutrality was observed by their banks and bankers? There is little doubt that this could be done. If no financial assistance could be obtained

from the outside, few nations would, in the face of this most effective neutrality of the other Powers, incur the peril of bankruptcy. Some wars would probably not take place at all, and those that could not be avoided would certainly last a much shorter time.

Admiral Mahan's claim that peace can be attained only by "that same slow process by which we have attained our present civilisation" ignores the fact that, in this age of endless forms of organisation, rapid communication, and widespread education, the progress of past centuries is now being equalled in decades, not merely in material achievements, but in mental and spiritual advance. With one bound, China has advanced intellectually more in ten years than in the previous thousand. Japan and Mexico in fifty years have achieved more than in two hundred previously. International peace no more demands the "slow processes" of the past than does international business. In fact, it is the demand of the constructive business mind that the lack of law and the insecurity now evidenced by the existing system of defence shall cease. Besides the actual cost in taxation, the indirect loss is enormous from the putting into the production of armour-plate and cannon of the industry which is so sorely needed to double-track our railroads, to finish with steel instead of with inflammable wood our great office buildings, and to promote a thousand other kinds of constructive work.

Besides failing to draw distinction between international and civil war, Admiral Mahan still further darkens understanding by confounding in one category all forms of repressive force. He asserts that the abolitionists of international war are practically saying, "It is wicked for society to organise and utilise force for the control of evil." Now only men like Tolstoi and his few followers hold that all use of physical force is wrong. Not one in fifty of the opponents of international war takes that view. But, just as they discriminate between the kind of war which an organised world can speedily end and civil war which it cannot thus prevent, so they distinguish between the use of a minimum of force necessary to achieve a judicial decision and the use of the maximum of force to settle questions irrespective of a judicial decision. The peace party believes in police; the latter's business in common civil society is, so far as it uses force at all, to use the least amount necessary to get a man before twelve disinterested jurymen and a judge, to have his case decided by law, after evidence has been given. The police have no right themselves to execute punishment, nor to beat any man who goes readily to court. Their usual task requires no exercise of force at all. They rescue the helpless from burning buildings and the motor-car, and they perform a thousand kindly, protective deeds. The militia is a state police, intimidating lynchers and rioters, but never pursuing and shooting a mob that disperses on the

reading of the riot act. Upon occasion, both police and militia may be forced to kill men who defy law and judicial procedure, if there is no way of getting them to court; but they do not set out to do this. Their type of force will remain so long as criminals exist; but a civilised community will permit no other type. Only uncivilised communities will much longer tolerate the international duelling called "war," which never aims to get a judicial decision and never provides for the equal weapons and "fair play" which is always demanded even in the duel between two individual combatants.

War is to be condemned, primarily, not because it means death and destruction, but because it never aims at justice and never achieves any measure of justice, except accidentally, incidentally, and partially. What attempts to secure judicial decisions do our costly dreadnoughts make? When those hundreds of thousands of young men, born four thousand miles apart, faced each other in Manchuria and on the Yellow Sea, where were judge and jury and witnesses? How many poor conscripts in every thousand knew why they were killing their brother man? Perhaps no fallacy is more widespread and dangerous than the idea that armies and navies are a "national police." True, they are occasionally called on for police functions, as when California and Jamaica earthquakes render assistance necessary. But food can be sent in vessels without inches of

armour plate, and this occasional activity of war-vessels no more makes them a police force than the grocer's occasional fighting of a forest fire at the demand of the fire-warden makes him by profession a fireman. Probably battleships were once useful to protect us from Barbary pirates. But pirates are as dead as the Spanish Inquisition; and the men who once captured them sailed in little wooden ships. A genuine police aims always either at kindly, protective work or at getting with the minimum of force a criminal before a court of law. The police of one city never fight the police of another city. A navy is a tool of government which is created for the settlement of difficulties through the maximum of force, by dint of strategy and explosives, irrespective of justice. A navy exists simply that it may fight another navy. The police type of force, as President Eliot has pointed out, is vastly higher than the military type. An individual soldier may be nobler and braver than an individual policeman, but his work is to destroy and the latter's is to save. The soldier's task, though he be not responsible for it, has in history chiefly been to do openly on a large scale what the murderer and thief and "fire bug" do stealthily on a small scale. Man is the only animal that deliberately plans to destroy his own kind. Tigers kill sheep, but rarely other tigers; wolves, lions, snakes prey on other creatures for food but not on their own kind. Crafty and cruel man is the only created being that plans systematically to crush

and destroy his own race and trains his offspring to continue the process of extermination.

The abolitionists of war stand for justice as the paramount issue. The peace party makes no "mollycoddle" plea about hardship and pain; it has no craven fear of death. But it abhors, in this age of enlightenment, the beast's way of settling issues by tooth and claw and the devil's way of blowing up by treacherous mines the innocent victims of a government which votes to settle boundary-lines or questions of "honour" by explosives. But to Admiral Mahan this way is a valuable and reverend method of settling "those momentous differences which cannot be settled by arbitration." He finds in arbitration no practicable solution for various new racial and economic problems that are looming up portentously. He is much concerned over questions involving the national conscience, and says: "There is an absolute indisposition, an instinctive revolt against signing away, beforehand, the national conscience by a promise that any other arbitrator than itself shall be accepted in questions of the future." Why, we ask, should there not be an instinctive revolt to the only alternative to this that Admiral Mahan can suggest—namely, settlement of questions of conscience by explosives? Which is the more likely to settle any question justly,—the body of judges, fallible to be sure, like all other mortals, but under oath and the eyes of the world carefully investigating evidence and rendering a verdict, or

an admiral who knows nothing of the points at issue, but knows only where to send torpedo-boats to destroy the most life and property? Which settlement, be it absolutely just or not, leaves the least rancour,—Bismarck's and Louis Napoleon's method at Sedan, or the commission's in London which settled the Alaska boundary? Admiral Mahan does not seem to concern himself about justice in these international affairs. He admits that war does not settle an ethical question. The impossibility of a nation being an impartial judge in its own case does not appear to affect him when condemning arbitration of the more important international difficulties. His principle, logically carried out, would in 1789 have prevented our thirteen quarrelsome colonies from agreeing, in their ratification of the Constitution, to the provision for reference of all interstate differences as to boundary lines, vital interests, and honour to a Supreme Court not yet appointed. Certain States had then more grudges against each other than the United States has with any foreign nation to-day. Yet their full consent to abide by the pledges of an unknown court has since that date kept the peace between one State and another.

Admiral Mahan's references to wars of religion in the past are irrelevant to the future. Such wars as may come will be chiefly for markets or territory or privilege. His assumption that questions of honour cannot be arbitrated is not held by the governments of Holland, Denmark, the five Cen-

tral American states, Chili, and Argentina, which have all signed treaties to arbitrate every question with each other—rational conduct which Admiral Mahan's own country would, but for a few politicians in the United States Senate, have emulated through treaties with England, France, and Germany. Questions of "conscience" to-day belong chiefly to domestic politics, like slavery, suffrage, socialism, education, and temperance. When the abuse of weaker peoples, like the Armenians, becomes a question of "conscience," a joint conference of Powers and the employment of organised non-intercourse can accomplish what no single nation can achieve by forcible aggression and dictatorship.

Three powerful adjuncts to arbitration as means of promoting a rational settlement of difficulties are practically ignored by Admiral Mahan. These are neutralisation, non-intercourse, and peace budgets. The first two will be treated in the next chapter. The peace budget has not yet been widely broached, but is big with promise for the future. It was one of the recommendations made by the Interparliamentary Union, composed of the statesmen of the world, at their great meeting in London in the summer of 1906. Had one dollar been devoted to peace for every thousand in the annual war budget, it would have given us \$200,000 in 1906, when certain people were thrown into a childish panic over a score of Japanese men found in the schools of San Francisco. This sum put into the hands of a commission appointed by the

President would have enabled us to invite here fifty eminent Japanese, and to have sent fifty of our distinguished citizens to Japan. It would have provided for an interchange of thought, for receptions, lectures, innumerable courtesies, and have led to a vastly better understanding, besides providing for systematic helpful work in the press and pulpit of the Pacific coast—worth far more than the cost of a battleship in assuring hysterical citizens of safety. A dollar spent in winning friends by promoting understanding is worth a thousand spent in preparing to fight would-be friends when we have turned them into enemies. With proud and sensitive Orientals, courtesy and good-will are our most powerful methods of maintaining peace. As soon as the enormous possibilities of this new method are understood, pressure should be brought to bear on Congress from every State to vote annually at least the price of one torpedo-boat, to deal with a problem which is primarily psychological and can never be settled by the costly, diabolic mechanisms of destruction. The common-sense rapprochement between England and France, already infinitely beneficial, the helpful interchange of visits and courtesies between English and German editors and merchants, Secretary Root's friendly visit to South America and his kindly offices in promoting peace between the states of Central America, are but a slight beginning of the great, systematic conciliation work to be done in case of incipient friction

long before arbitration is to be employed. This should play an enormous part in the future programme of the American government, which makes such loud claims of its pacific purposes. This must be in addition to increased official and diplomatic measures and be entrusted largely to tactful specialists and journalists. Great Britain's Chancellor of the Exchequer has given the pledge of his government to the establishment of a peace budget, the value of which he warmly recognises. He asked for \$300,000 per annum and was voted \$80,000. Japan devoted perhaps \$500,000 to the entertainment of the American fleet; but one tenth of that sum, as some one has said, would have provided for the reception of fifty American editors in Japan or of Japanese editors in America and have been of far greater value in promoting international amity than the whole costly and spectacular world cruise. It is not sailors who make war so much as journalists. It is probable that the price of one battleship, wisely expended in three or four leading nations, could do more for the peace of the world than all its combined navies. The disbursal of such a budget would probably be by a commission appointed by the President. Its influence would be vastly out of proportion to the slight expenditure in creating that good-will and confidence on which national security depends; and as an agency for promoting international justice and the world's peace it would be vastly more promising than all of Admiral Mahan's battleships.

CHAPTER VII

NEUTRALISATION AND NON-INTERCOURSE

A MEASURE of great promise which increased international organisation renders possible is the neutralisation of weak and exposed countries, thus freeing them from danger and aggression, as the Philippines might be freed, with the consequent cutting off of half our navy. No nation could refuse the request of our government to guarantee autonomy and neutrality to the archipelago when we withdraw. A refusal would be tantamount to advertising prospective aggression. The neutralisation of Switzerland, Belgium, and Norway, and the self-renouncing agreement between England and the United States to leave the three thousand miles of borderline between the United States and Canada unguarded are some of the notable beginnings in the use of a method which will in the future play a gigantic part in sidetracking jealousy and preventing friction. Who can question that, since France, Great Britain, Germany, and Russia "agree together to respect her autonomy and to act in concert in her support if she should be menaced by any Power," Norway is now free to

spend her united resources in building herself up, instead of in guarding her frontier? The agreements, signed in April, 1908, in Berlin and St. Petersburg, by the Powers bordering on the North and Baltic Seas, to respect each other's territory, is a matter of great moment which has received amazingly little attention. The possibilities of these measures should be discussed a thousand times as much by our citizens as the technical questions of turrets, armour belts, etc., with which the papers have deluged us, as if the safety of the republic from invasion depended solely upon these. Neutralisation of the ocean, which involves the immunity of private property at sea in time of war, would mark an immense stride forward; England's refusal to agree to this at the Second Hague Conference was a world misfortune and a cardinal blunder. A half century ago Whewell, whose admirable version of Grotius like so much besides attests his profound grasp of international law, pronounced neutrality "the true road to a perpetual peace," and declared that the safety of the world depends on making neutrality easy.

Since 1785, the United States has stood for the immunity of private property at sea from capture in time of war; yet the piracy which has been forbidden in war on land has remained to disgrace the naval code of international law. Benjamin Franklin's last official act in Europe before his return home in 1785 was to sign a treaty with Frederick the Great, containing this memorable clause: "Al

merchants and trading vessels employed in exchanging the products of different places, and thereby rendering the necessities, conveniences, and comforts of human life more easy to be obtained and more general, shall be allowed to pass free and unmolested." Washington said of this treaty that it "marks a new era in negotiation; should its principles be considered hereafter as the basis of connection between nations, it will operate more fully to produce a general pacification than any measure hitherto attempted amongst mankind."

At the First Hague Conference, Ambassador Andrew D. White made a noble plea for the acceptance of this doctrine by the Conference. Many delegates were uninstructed how to vote on the measure and, after an impressive presentation of it by Dr. White, the subject was relegated to the second Conference. At this Conference, in 1907, Hon. Joseph H. Choate eloquently traced the efforts made from the time of our treaty with Great Britain in 1783 to have the private property of all citizens of the signatory powers, with the exception of contraband of war, exempt from capture or seizure. Such a proposition, it could at once be seen, ought to be a measure which would relieve England in time of war from all anxiety about her food supply from over seas. Germany supported the United States, and so did the majority of those voting, but, with Great Britain, France, and Russia in the negative, no agreement was

reached. Still the need of protecting her merchant marine is always goading England to enlarge her navy, and, so long as Germany's merchant marine advances with leaps and bounds, her navy will follow suit. It is safe to say that when England follows the advice of her late Lord Chancellor, Lord Loreburn, who is a strong supporter of the doctrine of the immunity of private vessels in war time, and persuades France and Russia to follow suit, one half of England's huge navy, which is maintained chiefly to protect her commerce, will have no excuse for being, and the other nations may diminish theirs proportionately.

The fallacy, not uncommon, that an evil is likely to be ended more quickly if it is permitted for the present to do as much harm as possible, and that the relieving of merchants and consumers from loss in time of war would make them less solicitous to end war, has no justification in history. We do not lessen drunkenness, ignorance, nor crime by letting them run their course and teach their saddest lessons. Wars were far more frequent when they were more savage. When theft was punished by hanging, and clipping coins by shaving off the ears, these crimes were not thereby diminished. Permitting evils to grow makes men merely callous and bestial. Curtailing them in any degree makes men just so much more sensitive. We are shocked by a barbarity that is infrequent, not by one that is frequent.

What is to prevent the air and sea and every

weak spot on the globe from being neutralised as soon as the business men of the world come to realise that there is a genuine defence stronger than armour-plate or aeroplane destroyers, a defence of which most are to-day as oblivious as all once were of wireless telegraphy and the gyroscope?

In view of the enormous development of aviation and the eagerness of militarists to extend warfare into this new field, perhaps the most important application of the principle of neutralisation is to the realm of the air. The attempt at the First Hague Conference "to prohibit, for a term of five years, the launching of projectiles and explosives from balloons or by other new methods of a similar nature" did not receive the consent of Italy, Great Britain, or Japan. Yet Japan, though not bound by pledge, did not affront the moral sense of nations by using this method in the Russian war; neither did England in the Boer war,—as Italy, according to report, has done in Tripoli. In 1907, at the Second Hague Conference, no nation made any reservation in the prohibition of "attack or bombardment by whatever means of towns, villages, dwellings, or buildings which are undefended." This would exclude aerial attack there. To extend the hell of war to a new region just as the new substitutes for war are being adopted, with the certainty that the smallest nation with an "airy navy" may destroy the forts and dreadnoughts of the greatest and that all the civilised world must face a new horror with no increase of

safety, seems beyond the power of words fitly to characterise.

Another force which is also underestimated or ignored by Admiral Mahan and his school is the force of non-intercourse. China, which the Admiral speaks of as "at the mercy of the so-called Christian nations," was not only the inventor of gunpowder, but has been conspicuously the employer of a force which, when widely adopted by the western world, may prove more efficacious than the explosive which the nations so readily accepted and employed. Even a few unorganised Chinese merchants, unsupported by their government, were able, in a nation without a navy, to bring to some measure of justice our great nation with a navy second only to England's, when their boycott of our goods, a few years ago, wrought havoc in the cotton trade. Their recent boycott of Japanese goods quietly secured the desired and just concessions. What would not be the power of 400,000,000 organised Asiatics backed by their government if, twenty-five years from now, they should unite to refuse to deal with any nation that had wronged them and transfer their trade to a more friendly nation? The late Justice Brewer of the Supreme Court well said that

The Hague Court will never need an army nor navy behind it to enforce its decisions. If all the civilised nations would say to a recalcitrant government, "From this time forward, until you submit your dis-

pute to arbitration, we will withdraw our diplomatic representatives, we will have no official communication with you, we will forbid our citizens having any business transactions with your citizens, we will forbid your citizens coming into our territory, we will make you a Robinson Crusoe on a desert island"—there is no nation, however mighty, that could endure such an isolation. The business interests of the nation would compel the government to recede from its position and no longer remain an outlaw on the face of the earth.

The mere threat of non-intercourse with any nation by an organised world would be quite adequate; it would never need to be carried into execution, any more than our army is ever called on to enforce decisions of our Supreme Court. It is the rational, bloodless, and effective weapon suited to an organised world which produces the largest results with the least waste and expense. It is *par excellence* the Christian method. It is the political application of the "shaking the dust off the feet" and "Let him be anathema." It is wholly removed from the spirit of violence and revenge, and must not be associated with the sudden, unannounced boycott which often does gross injustice in disputes between labour and capital. Non-intercourse should become a recognised penalty and be so pronounced in international law and treaties.

If even three friendly nations—the United States, Great Britain, and France—should begin

and, agreeing to arbitrate every question with each other, as two of them have already done for one hundred years, also agree that if one of the three should be attacked the two others should declare non-intercourse with any nation that, refusing arbitration, thus went to war, such an agreement published to the world would secure absolute immunity from attack for all three, and would practically result in the rest of the world joining with them, thus furthering a world organisation which alone can bring international peace. This beginning would of course involve definite arrangements to reimburse merchants if an embargo ever became a fact, and it would include an invitation to every other nation to enter this league for promoting peace without armaments. Preparations for war in 1912 are as costly as actual war in 1898, but preparations for international non-intercourse as a substitute for war would cost nothing but the cost of international lawyers' fees and of the drawing up of treaties. Bombardments affect only coast towns, but a withdrawal of business would affect as well even the hamlets farthest inland where any one bought or sold. At the least cost, the most effectual compulsion towards peace is in the hands of the three Powers that are first willing to arbitrate everything with each other. Ultimately even the threat of non-intercourse will be needless; but as the next step in providing a substitute for the force that aims at bloodshed it seems necessary to have

this resource theoretically available, though in all probability it would never be used a single week.

The degree of national defence needed is merely a question of relation to existing danger and bears no necessary relation to population, length of coast line, "dignity," or wealth. As to wealth, the richer a country, the better customer it is, and the less likely to be attacked by sensible nations that want customers. Moreover, the wealthier a country, the sooner can it buy ships and ammunition in sudden exigency. To-day war is primarily a question of financing war loans. China has a population ten times as large as that of France, but it does not therefore need ten times as large a navy. Since the Second Hague Conference in 1907, the danger of bombardment of unfortified towns is ended, and therefore length of coast line is no measure of degree of danger. As one of our delegates to the Hague Conference has said: "If we want less danger, we have but to tear down fortifications." Should Cervera's fleet approach our coast to-day, as during our Spanish War it was feared it might, the safest place would be a village on the long stretch of unguarded shore, which is not only protected from bombardment and demand for tribute, but may legally defend itself from invasion by planting mines. A navy has no more to do with the dignity of a country than have fire-engines or life-saving stations. The degree of danger is largely a psychological question, requiring far more knowledge of human nature

than of mechanics. The man whose thought has been for forty years focussed on the question of how to make and use the best instruments for killing enemies is the last man in the world to understand how to prevent making enemies. The health of the world depends not so much on bleeding and blisters and amputation as upon draining swamps and tearing away slums, upon sun and air, upon exercise and courage. The peace of the world depends not so much on steel destroyers as on the constructive, courageous statesmanship that forestalls enmity and turns it into bonded friendship.

CHAPTER VIII

THE PROBLEM OF THE PHILIPPINES

THE subject of neutralisation suggests at once to the thoughtful American the imperative problem of the future of the Philippines, in the solution of which problem neutralisation may perform so decisive a part. The nation's present attitude toward Philippine independence must be determined largely by the settlement in the first place of the fundamental question of our moral right to have forced sovereignty upon protesting aliens, upon whom we had no natural claim. Decency and the world's progress forbid neglect of weaker peoples. We must treat them in one of three ways,—fraternally, paternally, or imperially. True fraternal treatment—lending a helping hand, as England did with the Malay states under Sir Andrew Clarke for twenty years—has never failed whenever, in the rare instances in history, it has been tried. We treated Japan fraternally, and we are not ashamed of the result. Paternal treatment, such as we gave Cuba, recognising, as a father does in a child, potential political equality, yet the need of temporary guidance and control

has often been justifiable, when it has not meant killing men to make them yield.

We used neither of our accustomed methods of fraternal or paternal treatment in dealing with the Philippines. Eminent statesmen have surmised that in some future age the islands might possibly be glad to be related to us as Canada and Australia are to England. They forget that whatever bond binds a daughter to a mother-land is based on blood relationship and oneness of tradition. Possessions and colonies are as diverse as servants and children in a household. That masqued phrase, "colonial policy," has done much to confuse the man who reads newspaper headlines and not history to learn what he shall think. We can never have a colonial policy with any except our own blood. England has a colonial policy in Canada, but not in India.

Instead of the fraternal or paternal way, shall we elect to imitate Old World imperial methods in the Philippines? For imperialism, whatever else it may include, means the control of a weak people by a strong one without any promise of granting the weak people either independence or political equality and incorporation. It simply means treating the Philippines as England has treated India. Does the United States want to be responsible for the multiplication of little Indias? Congress, to be sure, never explicitly adopted the imperial policy or any policy; yet so strong was the assumption, years ago, that we "would never haul

down the flag in the Philippines," that only the small anti-imperialist group protested against it. Maurice Thompson, in an imperialist address to the graduating class of Boston University, said to an enthusiastic audience which crowded Tremont Temple during those critical days, "Cuba is ours as much as Louisiana." We have short memories and are glad to forget some things which the scrap-books of a dozen years ago reveal of the arrogance, the lack of political science, and the stupid elation which were everywhere manifest during the period following that fateful letter of President McKinley's, in December, 1898, asserting sovereignty over the islands, before Congress had ratified the Paris treaty. Not one man in ten seemed to know the difference between anti-expansion and anti-imperialism, or what imperialism meant. It is difficult, even after this short lapse of years, to recall the vicious attacks made in the press at that time upon conscientious, honourable gentlemen, who did not favour our acquisition of the Philippines. General Funston declared in a notable public speech that if the critics of the Philippine policy were hanged by lynching they would get no more than their deserts, and he referred to the venerable Senator Hoar as a "person with a superheated conscience." One great New York daily remarked of Professor Charles Eliot Norton of Harvard: "Had the professor lived under almost any other flag than the Stars and Stripes, he would now in all probability be the occupant of

a prison cell, under conviction of treasonable utterances." In Norman Angell's *Patriotism Under Three Flags*, the author comments on the habitual language of some of the more popular newspapers, which seemed to indicate a real dementia during the war with Spain, and he quotes by way of illustration from the newspaper with the largest circulation:

Occasionally we hear croaks from the peace men. "How sad to kill sons and fathers of sad-eyed women!" they say, . . . etc. No sadder than to kill cousins and aunts of sad-eyed rattlesnakes. The man who would object to this war would object to the destruction of poisonous reptiles in India. And, as for the American who has any feeling about the war other than the red-hot desire to hear of victories and Spanish ships sunk, all we can say is that he reminds us of the cannibal toad now on exhibition in the Paris Jardin d'Acclimation.¹

¹ Two out of two hundred signed testimonies by American soldiers, describing scenes similar to those here described:

1. "Last night one of our boys was found shot and his stomach cut open. Immediately orders were received from General Wheaton to burn the town and kill every native in sight,—which was done to a finish. About a thousand men, women, and children were reported to be killed. I am probably growing hard hearted, for I am in my glory when I can sight my gun on some dark skin and pull the trigger. . . . Tell all my enquiring friends that I am doing all I can for Old Glory."

This was signed by A. A. Barnes, Battery G, 3d United States Artillery, and was first published in the *Standard* of Greensburg, Ind.

2. "Our orders [in Samar] were clear and strict. Everybody found in the hills, man, woman and child, was to be killed. Shoot

A definite promise of independence to these brown men, like that presented in Congress in the spring of 1912, would leave our position a paternal one; and it would mean far more than mere independence to them. It would mean that every weak nation upon earth which might have relations to us would breathe freer and lose dread of our aggression. It would mean that fear and jealousy would be supplanted by genuine respect throughout the world; that our dangerously growing militancy would be checked, and that we should again stand pre-eminent upon the height of progress toward world organisation and peace, whence the Old World has seen us step down to push and elbow our way in the crowd with others while boasting that we had thus become a "world power."

Rear-Admiral Taylor at a Reform Club banquet in Boston, in reply to a question, admitted

all hogs and dogs, was the order, and we were not instructed to spare children. . . . I saw as many as twenty Filipinos given the water cure. The native, of course, resisted, and the soldier rubbed the bottle across the mouth lacerating the flesh and breaking the teeth and leaving the man's face covered with blood. After the cure was over, the prisoner was shot and his body left for the dogs. One night last November we found seven old natives in a shack. The native interpreter plied them with questions, but they refused to tell anything, so we tied them in a row and shot the lot and left them for the dogs. . . . I was very sick."

This appeared in the *Philadelphia Record*, as the statement from Michael Snee, Company M, Ninth Infantry, under command of John B. Schoeffel, Rochester, N. Y., April 21, 1902.

that if it were not for our Philippine possessions we could reduce our navy one half. This fact is one of the prime reasons for granting independence. A Secretary of War has claimed that those who urge a promise of Philippine independence do it for the sake of maintaining "consistency." This charge is gratuitous and groundless. He should certainly have known that the demand has been undeviatingly based upon profound conviction and a clear political philosophy. If the talk is of consistency, may it not with real force and with full warrant be maintained that it is for the sake of a poor consistency that the present policy in the Philippines is continued? Do our intelligent people really believe that if the nation had free choice to-day it would do as it has done? There is no attempt here to minimise the admirable and often heroic work which has been done in the islands both by teachers and officials of high integrity. The advance in sanitation, in road-building, in providing a model printing plant, hospital, and prison are thankfully conceded. So fortunate have we been in this respect that the good conduct of officials in the islands has rendered us complacent and contented, quite sure that no other great power ever treated a weaker one half so well. But the fact remains that most of this advancement might have been accomplished without war and insistence on our sovereignty, though it might have taken longer under the guidance of paid experts who could exert no force.

It is no mere coincidence that race hatred and civic corruption have had such a recrudescence among us since we became imperialistic in our foreign policy, and that there is everywhere manifest in the republic such an indifference to things spiritual as we have not seen for half a century. It is often said that "a self-government by a people must be better than any government of the people by any other government." No; government by an ignorant people may be far worse. But smooth-running and honest government is not the primary consideration. If it were, our national government would rightly have interfered when Kentucky feuds and Philadelphia ballot-box stuffing resulted respectively in anarchy and typhoid epidemics. So long as Kentucky and Philadelphia do not become a menace to the rest of the country, we say, "hands off," until they correct their own evils; for only so will these be permanently corrected and the people grow. Meanwhile let us help Berea College and Philadelphia reformers.

The prime question is, what right have we to refuse independence to any people who desire it as do the Filipinos, whenever, with whatever institutions they choose, they can keep the peace and be no menace to the world?¹ Our demand that Filipinos should learn a higher form of govern-

¹See Judge Blount's "The American Occupation of the Philippines," for perhaps the strongest plea for the independence of the islands. His long personal experience in the Philippines gives great weight to his judgments.

ment than that attained by Turkey and similar countries before they are permitted independence is a threat to the sovereignty of every weak and politically undeveloped people with whom we have relations. Once assert the principle that the Filipinos shall have no independence until they have achieved a self-control and experience and virtue which some parts of our own country have not reached, and do we not make our government logically a menace to half the world? We assume an arrogant and offensive position and take the latest and most difficult form of government as the only one that shall be recognised before independence is a right. In the century just opened no question is more important than the relation of the strong, progressive races to the backward ones. The settlement of our Philippine policy makes a momentous precedent not only for ourselves but for other nations. The only just and proper prerequisite to granting independence to any people would seem to be peace and safety. Peace and safety may be had under kings, dictators, or oligarchies as truly as under presidents or republics. The question of the relative values of different forms of government is another question.

The touching confidence of many that as soon as the Filipinos are fit for self-government we shall do the right thing by them, is not sustained by past experience. Our people generally know little and care less about the islanders. The Republican party certainly, which after an unprecedented

"campaign of education" saw nearly one half of the voters of the country vote for free silver, which it reprobated, cannot view that vote or various other votes since as a credential of complete political wisdom in our people, even when it is managing its own affairs; and no opinion is here expressed as to those votes in themselves.

When William H. Taft was Secretary of War, by explicitly promising "ultimate complete self-government and independence" to the Philippines he placed himself virtually in the ranks of the anti-imperialists, the only point of difference being as to the date of granting independence. But, alas, this policy has not been adopted by Congress. Who can doubt that if this paternal policy had been definitely declared by Congress in 1899, the extermination of the bravest and ablest natives, the water-cure torture, the "Burn and kill, kill and burn" order of General Smith, would never have followed, and that, by winning confidence through definite and outspoken rejection of the imperial policy, we should, at a fraction of the cost, have now accomplished vastly more for development and reform? The later tranquillity, as Mr. Taft declared, was due to our keeping our pledges of giving gradual self-government. That tranquillity would never have been broken had Congress told the natives at the beginning what it ought to tell them now.

Ask the average grocer, clerk, and farmer—the "staunch common people" whose supposed hon-

esty and good sense we are told we may fall back on to save us from the despair we feel when we lay down books like *The Shame of the Great Cities*—ask these what they think we ought to do with the Philippines. Their answer is generally a stare. They do not think. They are for the most part relegating all thought on the deepest and most vital principle of government to a handful of men at Washington. “I guess the President will pull us through”; “I ’ll trust Uncle Sam to do the right thing!” are the comfortable conclusions of the descendant of the Puritans whose initiative and sense of responsibility are so slight that he is losing consciousness of the fact that “Uncle Sam” is nothing other than his neighbours and himself. Out of a hundred intelligent Bostonians whom I have asked as to who they supposed was paying for Philippine education, nine out of ten have been surprised to learn that the Philippines themselves and not the United States were paying the bills. The American common people have actually supposed that we were in the missionary business there, generously giving millions to these brown men. The sole important gift we have bestowed has been \$3,000,000—about one quarter of the cost of one battleship—during the period of famine and cholera.

Half of the year’s naval budget which we are told is necessary on account of our relation to the Philippines would give a five years’ education to every child and youth in the Philippines capable

of learning to use his hands or brains. To-day, 587,000 persons, at a cost of about \$2,600,000, are receiving education. In the savings of three years on our naval bill we could pay for ten years' industrial and political training for every Filipino, and save by it later the saddling of our children with the burden of a billion dollars' expenditure for superfluous battleships and forts.

An eminent editor once claimed, "So far as Philippine independence is a subject concerning which any one can speak with authority, it is a subject that demands personal acquaintance of the most varied character with the Philippines." This means that in the nature of the case only a few travellers and special students in this republic are competent to deal with a question which not only vitally concerns 8,000,000 people whom we govern, but concerns also the ethics of government, the basis of sovereignty, the right of independence, and our justification for future action toward other peoples. The editor's claim is the severest arraignment that could well be conceived of the possibility of our having or maintaining a government "by the people." On a vital political question, college presidents are deemed incompetent judges! Personal acquaintance with Philippine ethnology, topography, and technical details is assumed to be essential for the settlement, not of a campaign, or an investment, or a commercial treaty, but of the foundation principles on which our whole future foreign politics rests.

We all respect as good and wise men, many officials who have advised the retention of the Philippines. We all have the same respect for the reverend prelate in the Vatican. When those of us who are Protestants reject the religious tenets peculiar to his branch of the Christian Church, it is with a distinct confession that the Pope knows a thousand times as much as most of us regarding details of his Church's history and doctrine. A cabinet officer may know far more than forty college presidents combined about details of Philippine life and conditions. But his opinion of whether our voters can be trusted to do justice a century hence to people of alien race and instincts, which is a cardinal point at issue, is worth no more than that of any other man of equal intelligence. Jefferson Davis and Robert Toombs probably knew ten times as much about the negroes and the conditions of slavery in the South before the war as Abraham Lincoln and Charles Sumner. Were they therefore the better judges of the institution of slavery? We have not yet, at any rate, formed the fixed habit of counting them infallible. Neither in the Northern States, because not many people have had "personal experience" in the black belt, do they concede the claim that one should leave the settlement of the political status of the negro to reactionaries among the white folk there, who have summered and wintered him and therefore "know better than Northern college professors what they are talking about." Indeed in each

successive chapter of this unhappy Philippine history we have accepted flatly this specious Southern logic—and we are paying the price.

Our duty to promise independence to the Philippines as soon as, under any form of government which they choose or which naturally and properly comes to control, they can keep the peace and be no menace to other peoples, is a duty recognised and earnestly enforced by many men of high intelligence who have had "personal" knowledge of the Philippines. In the matter of personal experience and knowledge of the Filipino people, it is a question of one set of men against another. Disagreement about fact is just as common as disagreement about theory. The real differences of view have little to do with the extent of respective opportunities for particular observation. They have little to do with ideas of expediency or consistency. They are profound differences in political philosophy. The neutralisation of the Philippines, which has been previously discussed, should of course be coincident with the granting of independence. Our increased navy, due to holding the islands, is helping visibly to increase other navies. The burden of armaments the world over is growing vastly out of proportion to increase in population or wealth or danger.

There is a greater issue than even the education and rapid political development of the Filipino people, desirable as that is. This greater issue is not merely that our retention of the Philippines

involves us in increased naval and army expense equal to upwards of \$100,000,000 a year. The greater issue is that of the world's colossal increase of armaments, the danger of war, and the paralysis of business by even rumours of war. Not merely the welfare of eight millions, but progress toward lowering armaments by more than seven hundred millions of people is more or less involved in the question whether we speedily secure the neutralisation and independence of the islands. Neutralisation cannot be granted if we retain them.

With increased pressure brought to bear for the exploitation of the Filipinos by capital, is there much likelihood that we shall ever abandon the imperial for the fraternal policy unless we do it soon? Neutralisation and the grant of independence would not mean withdrawal of our counsel and friendly help in education, and they would permit the employment by Filipinos of experts like the American Mr. Shuster in Persia, or Sir Robert Hart, so many years at the head of the customs in China.

The time is passing when any one nation may be permitted to take a weaker people under its sole domination; hereafter this should be done only by a joint agreement of the powers. Just as no man in any township, no matter how superior his status or however large his estate, has a right to dominate over an ignorant or shiftless neighbour, except as selectman he is delegated authority by the town meeting, so when the world is a little further

organised, the self-imposed guardianship by any privileged nation of an unprivileged and backward people must cease. No sophistry about there being "no alternative except to leave them to anarchy" can satisfy a nation that wants to deal justly. Long before complete world-federation is achieved, a group of strong nations may provide control and guidance of the savage races while depriving any one nation of the right to exploit them selfishly.

CHAPTER IX

TWO MASTER MINDS

THE elder of the two subjects of this chapter, Jean de Bloch, born a poor Polish Jew in Warsaw in 1836, began life as a peddler, and rose to power, wealth, fame, and membership in the nobility. He became a great administrator of railroads, financing thousands of miles of railroad, and was intermediary between the Czar's ministers and the banking fraternity. A man of deep sympathies and shrewd insight, he travelled far and wide and wrote many books on industry, economics, society, and politics. He was a lifelong student of war and studied especially its relations to transportation and the commissariat. His greatest book, *The Future of War*, was a compilation, analysis, and demonstration of statistics and scientific facts, gathered by the great military experts of Europe, which his synthetic mind comprehended and revealed in their bearing upon our complex civilisation. His book, which passed under the critical review of six generals, has been called more influential in the promotion of peace than any other book since Grotius's *Rights of War and Peace*, and it was one of the three influences that

led the Czar to call the first Hague Conference. The work, which is in six volumes, is highly technical, filled with maps, charts, and statistics, and the final volume, published in English, contains his conclusions. He showed that smokeless powder and modern artillery are making essentially new conditions of warfare and that war on a great scale to-day implies, if the war be fought to a finish, such gigantic economic disaster as means national ruin for both combatants and loss to all the world, without either side winning a decisive victory, unless one were enormously overmatched, as happened in the Boer War. A few weeks after this war broke out, Bloch declared in a pamphlet that England would need an army of five against one to break down the Boers' defence; he was laughed at, but his prophecy was fulfilled. Though England finally won, largely through the deaths of women and children in the "concentration camps," her "victory" was a heavy loss. Though Bloch's arguments were for European conditions and some of his minor prophecies failed in the un-European conditions of the Boer and Russo-Japanese wars, yet the main features of his argument were sustained by these. The Japanese could never have reached St. Petersburg, and were glad to end the war without indemnity, as both they and Russia would have been bankrupt had they fought to a finish.

Said M. Bloch, in a conversation with William T. Stead:

I regard the economic factor as the dominant and decisive element. The soldier is going down and the economist is coming up. War has become more and more a matter of mechanical arrangement. Modern battles will be decided, so far as they can be decided at all, by men lying in improvised ditches, which they have scooped out to protect themselves from the fire of a distant and invisible enemy. As a profession, militarism is growing less attractive.

Turning to another aspect of the matter, he said:

No one who has seen anything of the squalor and wretchedness, the struggle with fever and famine, in the rural districts of Russia, especially when there has been a failure of harvest, can be other than passionate to divert for the benefit of the people some of the immense volume of wealth that is spent in preparing for this impossible war. The children of most Russian peasants come into the world almost like brute beasts, without any medical or skilled attendance at childbirth. Can you imagine the way in which infants are left inside the home of most Russian peasants, where the mothers have to leave them to labour in the fields? The child is left alone to roll around the earthen floor of the hut, and as it will cry for hunger, poultices of chewed black bread are tied around its hands and feet so that the little creature may have something to suck at until its mother returns.

In view of this dire poverty of scores of millions in Russia, and of the illiteracy of ninety per cent. of the recruits, he used his genius to demonstrate

the folly of the modern world in attempting to gain wealth or safety by more armaments.

Bloch's studies were inspired by profound interest in suffering humanity and by clear perception of the inexpressible folly of war under modern conditions. He provided at Lucerne a Museum of Peace and War, and desired to have this duplicated in every great capital. Six months before his death in 1902, he said to the writer at a London breakfast, after discussing his theories at length, "Madam, whenever you talk to people on this subject, don't waste your time in telling them how wicked they are; tell them what fools they are."

In 1910 there appeared in England a little book entitled, *Europe's Optical Illusion*, written by Norman Angell, a man unknown to fame, though a few Americans had found much food for thought in two papers on "American Patriotism" and "American Farming" in a previous book of his entitled *Patriotism Under Three Flags*. Before the year was over, Count von Metternich, German Ambassador to England, delivered a speech which was a frank paraphrase of this little book, it had been quoted at length in the French Assembly, had attracted the attention of King Edward and the Kaiser, and was confounding the admirals and diplomats of Europe, including Sir Edward Grey, who declared that the "illusion," viz., the false and futile idea of the economic advantage of military victory, had first dawned on his vision through

reading this book. The chiefs of four European states asked for a book in place of a booklet; whereupon, a year later appeared *The Great Illusion*, embodying the gist of criticisms on the earlier book that had filled columns of the newspapers, together with their keen and cogent refutation.

Who was the master mind which from obscurity had thus leaped to eminence? Ralph Norman Angell Lane, born in England in 1874, and bred in Norfolk and Lincolnshire, was educated privately and sent at an early age to the Lycée de Saint Omer in France and afterwards to Switzerland. Soon after leaving school, he went to California for his health, and became a naturalised American citizen. In the West he was brought into touch with American politicians and was profoundly impressed with the fierceness of the Anglophobia which prevailed there at that time. Undoubtedly it was his American experience which, nearly twenty years ago, started the whole train of thought which has marked his work since. He has explained how, day after day, he heard from the mouths of American politicians that Great Britain was plotting the downfall of America, that the one duty of Americans was to annihilate Great Britain. He himself has said of that experience: "It roughly comes to this: seventy or eighty millions of kindly, honest, sincere, and intelligent people talking arrant nonsense and all of them absolutely wrong. When such a thing is possible there is something radically at fault with the

commonly accepted idea at the bottom of international politics."

In 1897, Norman Angell, with some experience of American journalism, engaged in journalistic work in Paris where he studied minutely the Dreyfus case. After the Boer War, his *Patriotism Under Three Flags*, a study of English, French, and American patriotism, was published. He had meantime become the editor of *Galignani's Messenger*, in which, during the worst period of the Anglo-French bitterness, he daily pleaded for saner Anglo-French relations. Many hundreds of articles forecasting the ideas embodied in *Patriotism Under Three Flags* and in *The Great Illusion* are buried in the files of the now defunct *Galignani's Messenger*.

In 1905, he organised a Continental edition of the London *Daily Mail*, though he was hostile to the political views of that journal; his position being purely administrative, he was in no way responsible for these views. It is an open secret that his influence on the proprietors and leading writers of the *Mail* has to some extent modified their position as to international conflict. After the phenomenal success of his book, the columns of the paper were open to his contributions. He himself has said, "I have done more for the cause of peace in getting my articles accepted in the *Daily Mail* than in writing *The Great Illusion*,"—his point being that through this paper he spoke to the non-converted and planted seeds in the minds of

those whom it would be impossible to reach through anything which bore the "taint" of pacifism. He has realised that his association with this hitherto bitter and chauvinistic sheet has exposed him to some criticism, but he was satisfied that he could thus best advance his purpose of opening the eyes of the blind to the fallacies which pose as prudence and patriotism and create that "mirage of the map" which leads the visionary to see populous cities on the desert waste.

Norman Angell's book, written in racy, popular style in one volume, is an up-to-date and far more explicit demonstration of the economic argument suggested by Bloch, and as such will here have more attention. He omits all discussion of the revolutionary methods of modern warfare as presented by Bloch and all reference to the great promoters of the judicial settlement of difficulties,—Hugo, Cobden, Burritt, Sumner, etc.,—confining himself solely to revealing the new financial arguments for peace which will appeal to millions who are indifferent to the call of justice or humanity, and are not influenced by the increasing cost of armed peace.

Asking one day a prominent French banker whether he thought the Bank of France could stand if the Bank of England failed, he received a negative reply. "Do you suppose the Reichsbank at Berlin could stand in such a case?" he then inquired. "I shall have a number of leading German bankers here to dine, and I will invite you to meet them and propound the question," said

the Frenchman. Again a negative reply was given by the Germans; whereupon this young man in his thirties began modestly to show these grey-haired financiers what was involved in that confession when their nations talked of war. From that day to this, he has been opening the eyes of the world's financiers, and his *Great Illusion* has been translated into eight languages, including Japanese. Sir Frank Lascelles, formerly British Ambassador at Berlin, related, at a banquet given in his honour at Glasgow, a conversation that he held with King Edward, who referred him to this book, which had greatly interested his Majesty. "I read the book," said the Ambassador, "and while I think it is not a question of practical politics, I am convinced that it will change the thought of the world in the future."

But Norman Angell's demonstration of the futility of modern war is fast becoming a matter of practical politics. Bankers are awaking, and in January, 1912, when Mr. Angell addressed the "Institute of Bankers" in London, there was so great a crowd that the doors had to be closed against those for whom there was no room. The gist of his teaching was profoundly ethical, though couched in the language of the Exchange. He showed his hearers that banking, all unconsciously, is bringing peace, by making nations financially interdependent. This interdependence is largely the product of the last twenty years and reverses those conditions in which for ages, however wrong

aggression might be, there was some material reward for it, by levying tribute, or by the conquest of neighbouring colonies. Not even the peace advocates have been alive to this stupendous argument from the recent changes in world conditions, but have dwelt on the unchristian character of war, while often tacitly assuming with their opponents that, if a nation stole, it might gain somewhat material advantage in spite of wickedness. This is to-day the great illusion that Norman Angell's facts and figures have made plain. That we, being many, are members one of another, is the profound truth to which he has suddenly revealed a new and stunning application, one that of necessity could not have been so fully perceived before.

When the prosperity of an average German factory is distributed pretty evenly over some such factors as these: the capacity of a peasant in Provence who sells his olives in New York to subscribe to a South American loan, in order that a dock might be built on the Amazon to enable the manufacturer in Manchester to sell furniture in Baku to a merchant whose wealth is due to the development of petrol consumption in an automobile trade created in Paris,—in a world where business is done under such conditions as these, we are told that the limits of commercial or industrial activity are determined by the limits of political influence, and that there exists some direct relation between political power and economic advantage! And we are still told it even when the prosperity of lesser

states with no political power give it daily the lie. The whole thing is one vast mystification, the most colossal illusion of the modern world.

He shows that it is the function of banking to destroy the false philosophy which assumes that bygone conditions still survive and that any nation has aught to gain by attacking another. Defence is proportioned to fear of attack, and this fear dominates the chancelleries of nations; but bankers are creating the complex nervous system of a new body politic which is bound to perceive the folly of these fears. Even as late as one generation ago, England alone of all the civilised world had vast masses of her population depending on her neighbours for food and raw material. These neighbours until recently held it a sound industrial policy, as England formerly did, to destroy or cripple the industry of other nations. England's dependence on other nations created a revolution in fiscal policy and an abandonment of the exploitation of colonies. New inventions, bringing the division of labour and rapid communication, have necessitated a new interdependence, which involves a lessening of physical force between all nations. Trade, no longer following the flag, follows the lines of least resistance. Little Switzerland without one battleship to her name outdoes England and gets trade from her in her own colony Canada. Political control over commerce lessens, and athwart political boundary lines co-operative

groups of employers and employees unite. The "telegraphic financial reaction," by which all attack or harm in toe or finger of the financial world is instantly felt in brain and heart, makes dreadnoughts every day more clumsy and futile as real means of aggression or defence. The England once self-contained, self-supporting, looking with equanimity at her rivals being overthrown, becomes a nation that will close mills and factories and face starvation if her rivals perish. The sufferings of her cotton operatives during our Civil War furnished the first lesson which she learned of her ever increasing dependence upon peace among her neighbours. "Bismarck," says the author of *The Great Illusion*, "was nearer to being able to apply the methods of Attila, nearly fifteen hundred years removed from him, than are we to being able to apply the methods of Bismarck, from whom only twenty years separate us."

Bismarck's successor in 1911, not having learned the lesson of national dependence which England had begun to learn a generation ago, was taught by German bankers that, whereas Bismarck could afford to fight the France of 1870, Germany, though with the advantage of twenty million more people, could not again afford the adventure of a war. He learned that the added millions of population were nearly all dependent on foreign food and earned their living by industries dependent to a large extent on foreign capital, chiefly French and English. Had Bismarck succeeded in his

stupid purpose to destroy the economic development of France, he would have prevented Germany's extraordinary development since the Franco-Prussian War. Just because the French people have small families to educate, they have more money to invest than Germans have. With a population even smaller than in 1870, France has ten times the annual foreign investments that she had then; whereas the necessity to start in the world twenty-odd million more Germans has more than absorbed all the capital that Germany could save.

The Pan-German's economics are borrowed from the era of the robber baron, to which era he belongs. Were he to ruin his conquered victims he must needs at once rehabilitate them in order to feed and clothe his own people. The traditional axioms of European statecraft are based on these robber-baron economics, as Norman Angell shows. Statesmen cannot understand how a nation can expand except by force of arms. Italy learns no lesson from France, for France has not yet perceived how unreal are most of her colonial gains and that, but for a larger place upon the map, and certain help to weaker peoples, she would be far better off were her dwindling population not drained from her shores. At a cost of many millions sterling, France has in the last thirty years built up a colony of twenty-five thousand Frenchmen in Tunis, living artificially and exotically under conditions which in the long run must be

inimical to their race. Yet in France are more Germans than there are Frenchmen in all the colonies which France has built up within the last fifty years, and German trade with France outweighs enormously the trade of France with all French colonies. France is a much better field for the Germans than any exotic colony which France owns could be.

The supposition that nations to-day have anything material to gain by confiscation is part of the great illusion that lures men on to conquest. Granted that an individual thief may rob a bank and live for ever undiscovered in the enjoyment of his wealth, the analogy fails with nations. Assume that Germany covets Holland, as so many fear, what could she gain by crushing out an independent power? First, a still greater dread and enmity on the part of England and France and the necessity of much further armament to protect more territory against more danger. Not a single German would gain a penny, for private property in Holland would of course still remain in the hands of Dutchmen. Though Dutch taxes would now be paid to Germany, the latter on the other hand would have the burden of the cost of increased administration, which would absorb the increased revenue. The illusion that rich lands would be acquired and bring more wealth would soon be dissipated. Increase of area and population means no more wealth *per capita*. The citizens of London are no richer than the citizens

of smaller New York, and the citizens of New York are no better off than those of still smaller Pittsburg. In like manner, the citizen of a large nation is no whit richer or better off than the citizen of a smaller one.

Norman Angell aptly illustrates his argument about the change of grounds for attack of one nation on another by the following incident:

Some years ago, the bank in a western mining town was frequently subjected to "holdups" because it was known that the great mining company owning the town kept large quantities of gold there for the payment of its workmen. The company therefore took to paying its wages mainly by cheque on a San Francisco bank, and by a simple system of clearances practically abolished the use of gold in considerable quantities in the mining town in question. The bank was never attacked again.

The dictum of a leading English journal that "if Germany were extinguished to-morrow, the day after to-morrow there is not an Englishman in the world who would not be richer," is thus commented on by Norman Angell:

One almost despairs of ever reaching economic sanity when it is possible for a responsible English newspaper to print matter which ought to be as offensive to educated folk as a defence of astrology or witchcraft. What does the "extinction" of Germany mean? Does it mean that we shall slay in cold blood

sixty or seventy millions of men, women, and children? Otherwise, even though the fleet and army were annihilated, the country's sixty million odd of workers still remain, prepared to exploit their mines and workshops with as much thoroughness and thrift as ever and consequently just as much England's trade rivals as ever, army or no army, navy or no navy. Even if England could annihilate Germany, she would annihilate such an important section of her debtors as to create hopeless panic in London. Such panic would so react on her own trade that it would be in no sort of condition to take the place which Germany had previously occupied in neutral markets, aside from the question that by such annihilation a market equal to that of Canada and South Africa would be destroyed.

Morgan, Rothschild, and great financiers are learning how futile are Russia's four millions of armed men and Germany's huge army and navy to produce financial security, when they perceive that the three per cents of powerless Belgium are quoted at 96, while those of Germany are at 82, and the three and a half per cents of Russia are at 81, while those of Norway are at 102.

It has taken the world not more than half a generation to readjust business to vastly different conditions created by electric light and heat and telephones. It ought to take less than another half generation for the business world to recognise the new reality of its organic nature created by the modern banker, to readjust its methods, adopt those suited to the time, begin transforming its

men-of-war into merchant marine, and set free the nations to struggle only with nature's obstacles, and no longer, futilely, with members of their own body. Where business men understand enough of modern economics to perceive their own interest, not only war but the war system will collapse and man will cease to be the only animal in the whole creation that, reversing the law of nature, systematically destroys his own kind.

Norman Angell's treatment of the psychological elements involved in international rivalries is no less acute than his treatment of economic relationships. Not only are economic interests and investments cutting athwart political border-lines, but ethical, religious, social, and all intellectual interests are doing likewise and creating friends in the country of every future possible enemy. It is in the recognition of new common interests that the perception of the great illusion will be attained and humanity cease trying to advance through self-mutilation.

Mr. Angell has been accused by Admiral Mahan of ignoring the primary cause of most wars—sentiment, prejudice, and a perverted sense of honour; but, as his first book shows, he is a past-master in the analysis of these and of the psychology of the mob. He realises that, while one might as well reason with the whirlwind after panic and passion are once let loose, nevertheless, if vague notions as to a nation's real interest are clarified in time of peace, and peoples once actually realise

what they are doing when they start to cut off their hands to spite their feet, the end of the present system of international anarchy will be in sight.

CHAPTER X

TEACHING PATRIOTISM

"THE right patriotism," said Emerson, "consists in the delight which springs from contributing our peculiar and legitimate advantages to the benefit of humanity."

Probably no word, except religion, has been so much abused and misused as this other sacred word, "patriotism." Religion has been confounded with ecclesiasticism and sectarianism, with form and creed and non-essential adjuncts of religion which have no more to do with religion itself than pew cushions, church spires, and La Farge windows have to do with visiting the fatherless and keeping oneself unspotted from the world. As the test of religion is love of God and service to his children, so the sole test of patriotism is love of country and service to its citizens, sharply to be distinguished from mere pride of country and boasting of ancestors who once were patriots.

One reads, "The bill to promote rifle practice and a patriotic spirit among the youth of the United States has passed the Senate." A child's paper recently published a picture of an old man

showing a boy a gun, inscribing underneath, "Teaching Patriotism." Careful questioning would probably elicit the opinion from a majority of American children that patriots fought for their country, and always fought with guns and swords, that it was more glorious to die on a battlefield than to live to serve one's country in time of peace, and that the chief function of the flag was to remind us of our glorious victories in war,—not that it would be so expressed, but it would be the tacit understanding. After an attempt to hold "a safe and sane" celebration of the Fourth of July in an eastern city some years ago, a citizen returning from the day spent in the country inquired of another what success they had had, to which question came the vehement response, "If this thing keeps on two years longer, we sha'n't have any patriotism left in the country." A teacher in Washington some years ago during our Spanish War on asking for a definition of patriotism, received the prompt reply, "It means killing Spaniards." These notions are so widespread that teachers as well as pupils often forget that the flag is the symbol of the whole country in time of peace as well as of war, and stands for its civic far more than for its military history. Since we as a nation have been at peace for nine tenths of our existence, our flag stands for peace far more than for war. While practically all pacifists admit that war in time past was sometimes inevitable, and while they honour the heroes who fought to

create and to preserve our independence and our unity, they rightly demand that our children be taught that even more honour is due the great statesmen who framed our Constitution—"the Hamlet and Ninth Symphony of political achievements"—and the inventors, teachers, preachers, poets, pioneers, and scientists who have made this country what it is, with the brave firemen, police, and physicians who have risked their lives in public service, and whose monuments are so conspicuous by their absence.

Said one of our eminent judges to a body of law-school graduates:

The dangers, if any exist to the nation, the state, or the city, are not in things outside of them, not in the yellow peril, not in foreign enemies, nor in foreign countries. The dangers lurk deeper, in the distemper, the bad spirit, the ignorance, corruption, evasion of jury duty and other public duties, and apathy among the people, in popular errors concerning the law, the State, and our obligations to it.

Pacifists demand that our schoolmasters teach children that men who give and take bribes are traitors to the flag, that men who will not take the trouble to vote are deserters from the ranks of service, and that those who will not sacrifice a little money or convenience to promote law and order, decency and health in their communities are as much cowards as are soldiers who skulk to the rear in battle. They should teach children

and youth that patriotism has no more to do with a gun than it has to do with a broom. Colonel Waring with his thousands of brooms, after a brave fight, in which some bones were broken, against the push-carts which blocked the streets of the East Side of New York, cleaned the great foul city as it was never cleaned before; and the removal of filth so reduced disease that during his régime the death-list marked a decrease of fifteen thousand. Surely our children should be taught that he who saves so many lives of American citizens does far more to defend his country than any general who leaves as many corpses of men from a neighbour nation upon a battlefield. In a *Primer of Patriotism*, supplied to schools by members of the Grand Army of the Republic, we find the first question propounded was, "What is the first position of a soldier?"—and another was, "What organisation to-day makes a specialty of teaching patriotism?"—to which the answer is, "The Grand Army of the Republic." Surely the time has come for a larger and profounder understanding of patriotism, which will make patriotism, like religion, pertain to the whole of public life and not to one narrow part of it, the part associated chiefly with the idea of bloodshed. As Patriots' Day and Decoration Day are days in which military glory and military history are celebrated, and the 18th of May has recently been dedicated by school authorities to the celebration of peace and international justice, is it not well that the school exercises on Flag Day

should be largely devoted to arousing an interest in civic patriotism and to showing that the spirit of the fathers of the republic is animating this generation to fight the "Black Hand" and fire-traps and sweat-shops as the fathers fought the hired Hessians from without? The spirit of protest against the greedy policy of "looking out for number one" in public life and the passion for service like that of Grenfell or Brandeis can be made to stir our High School boys to-day to new and higher enthusiasm than can target-shooting, if the teacher understands his business.

A five-year-old who learns not to throw his banana skin on the sidewalk and not to mark his neighbour's fence with chalk is learning the first lesson in that service which is the corner-stone of patriotism. Ten years later, he will more easily learn that patriotism which, in the spirit of the founders of the republic, stimulates one to serve his country all the time and which recognises that Lowell, Sumner, Garrison, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Colonel Waring, Dorothea Dix, and Booker Washington, Jane Addams and Jacob Riis, fighting slavery, filth, typhoid, and the empty dinner-pail, are just as truly patriots as any who on battle-fields have won spurs or epaulets. Not until the home and school teach that with the ballot far more than with the bullet is the patriot's power to serve his country; not until we erect in parks and halls as many statues of civic patriots, firemen, explorers, and statesmen as of military heroes, can

we expect a nation of men who understand true patriotism. Helen and Harry must be taught that good citizenship is no stupid, humdrum thing—merely dropping a ballot into a box on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November—but that it is precisely the rarest type of patriotism because the hardest; no inspiring bugle-call, or drum-beat, no pensions, titles, or gold lace throw glamour over the daily duty of trying to make honest, safe, clean, and beautiful the town or village where one lives.

As one cannot love God whom he hath not seen unless he love his brother whom he hath seen, how can your schoolboy love his great country which yet he has not seen unless he loves the little spot in it where he resides and for which he is most responsible? Teach him that unless the man who keeps the corner grocery at Podunk Four Corners wins his election without giving free drinks to the town vagrants; unless the railroad president thinks of the public's rights as much as of stockholders' dividends; unless the governor has a conscience like that of Charles E. Hughes, he must beware of calling himself by the high and holy name of patriot.

Good citizenship must be irradiated and exalted as the largest and noblest part of patriotism, and explicit instructions as to its scope and meaning should frequently accompany the flag salute; otherwise, to the unthinking child, it may become a meaningless fetich worship—mere "genuflex-

ions" as Woodrow Wilson has well phrased it. Pennsylvania, Delaware, Rhode Island, New York City, and certain Western cities whose officials have plundered the public purse show to how low an ebb patriotism has sunk among some of our most prosperous communities. As terrible as a Benedict Arnold in our army would be an Addicks in our Senate, the boss briber, an object lesson to the world of the way in which supine Americans reward the basest type of enemy of their national honour. We have fought red coats, grey coats, Mexicans, and Malays. It may be that we have our worst enemies yet to fight, and that unless the parents of to-day are teaching a truer patriotism the insidious foe within our midst may draw our life blood, while we are sinking fortunes in a navy built to scare the Kaiser and the Mikado. Let us not grudge time spent in our schools in teaching children explicitly how to serve their country. It is time quite as well spent as in teaching bank discount or French and Indian wars. Nothing in detail need here be said about honouring the valiant men who fought to win our independence or to preserve the Union; no word is needed. That the teacher will fulfil his duty as regards this goes without saying; he will hardly say too much about the misery, the starvation in prison, the squalor and wretchedness which the brave youth endured in the only two wars for which we had excuse. The lesson of Memorial Day need in no wise clash with that of Peace Day

which just precedes it. Let the pupil learn the solemn lesson of what it cost to free the slave and keep our country one and indivisible; and let him be disillusioned of the glamour of war by Dickens's description of "A Splendid Charge":

There will be the full complement of backs broken in two, of arms twisted wholly off, of men impaled upon their own bayonets, of legs smashed up like bits of firewood, of heads sliced open like apples, of other heads crunched into soft jelly by the iron hoofs of horses, of faces trampled out of all likeness to anything human. This is what skulks behind "a splendid charge." This is what follows, as a matter of course, when our fellows rode at them in style and cut them up famously!

But in view of the fact that preventable disease and accident are destroying every year vastly more than fell by bullets in those four tragic years of bloodshed, let the teacher in exalting patriotism lay the chief emphasis where it belongs. As the true preacher exhorts his hearers to put their religion into seven days in the week, the true teacher will show that real patriotism demands service and sacrifice every day in the year, every year in the century, and that this patriotism is as much for girls as for boys.

The relation of patriotism to internationalism may be illustrated to children by the story of the American who sixty years ago declared, "My first allegiance is to Harford County, my second is to

the State of Maryland, and my third, to the United States." Just as this type of provincialism has everywhere given way to a larger patriotism which recognises the whole country rather than the part as the first object of devotion, so now the times demand of North as well as of South a further emancipation from provincialism and a recognition of the fact that before one is a Russian, Frenchman, German, or American, he is a human being, a citizen of the world, a child of God. This loyalty to the largest whole implies no less loyalty and service to that part to which we are chiefly indebted. The great internationalists—Dante, Lessing, Kant, Mazzini, Victor Hugo, Cobden, Sumner, Hale—were always the most intense of patriots, seeing that only by the perfecting of their own nation could the nation serve as leader and benefactor among the peoples of the earth, thus satisfying Emerson's noble definition.

CHAPTER XI

TEACHING INTERNATIONALISM

EVERY age is more or less one of transition; but sometimes there comes a period so revolutionary that after it the world becomes a different world. Such a period was that half-century "when Gutenberg made thought cosmopolite and stretched electric wires from mind to mind," when gunpowder was discovered, and the great Genoese setting forth from Palos with his little fleet discovered a new world. Such a period is the one in which we live, when the word "internationalism" is coined to meet the new situation in world history. Whether we look to the fateful struggles in Russia and Siberia in which one hundred and twenty millions of people are through tears and blood slowly working their way to the freedom which we so thoughtlessly enjoy; whether we consider the significance of the labour movement in Europe and the gigantic capitalistic forces at work there or in America; the carving up of the "dark continent" by the white races, or the marvellous new civilisation in South America; the stupendous advance in Japan,

or the still more significant revolution in China,—wherever we look, we see that the old order has changed. Never since history began were so many hundreds of millions of people consciously and voluntarily altering their political, their industrial, and social conditions.

He who argues about international relations as if they were merely different in degree, and not in kind, from those of a century ago, is as short-sighted as a person who talks of business as if it were conducted without steam, electricity, or wireless telegraphy and as it was before the average workman had been expropriated from all control over and interest in both the material that he uses and the product that he creates. All this transformation must be graphically presented to the rising generation. The child must be taught that if in Washington's day there had been war between Russia and Japan, the small four-page newspapers in our sparsely settled States would have told little of it, and six months after Port Arthur had fallen a slow sailing vessel arriving in New York might have given the bare fact—but all that reporters, photographers, and Red Cross nurses would now add to that would have been missing. We should have had no commerce, no missionaries, no investments in Manchuria, and consequently little knowledge of nor interest in the war that filled its people with misery and gloom. He must be taught how all this has changed to-day, when Theodore Roose-

velt reaches Central Africa easier than Washington could go to St. Louis. During the Russo-Japanese War, 1200 Poles, escaping military service, arrived in Boston in one week and necessitated the citizens securing work for them if they were to keep them out of jails and hospitals. The child must learn that to-day every nation is affected, sooner or later, when any nation suffers. Whereas nations at the antipodes to each other were once as independent as so many marbles in a box, they are now, like heart and lungs and hands and feet all united as closely by steam and electricity as our bodily members are by nerves, and through all, like red blood, flows the world's trade. Our economic interdependence must be illustrated by showing even the youngest how nearly every land has helped to supply the food and clothes, the furniture and ornaments of his home. The teacher must point out the significance of the fact that our forty-page newspaper gives us yesterday's news from Tokio and Rio Janeiro and New Zealand; that Americans are making reapers to send to Siberia, iron bridges for South Africa, and sewing-machines for Egypt, and are putting money into coffee plantations in Brazil, into mines in Bolivia, and irrigation in Arabia; that from the ends of the earth men are flocking to our shores. We are not only New England, but New Ireland, New Germany, New Italy, and nearly fifty per cent of our population is of foreign parentage; in New York we have more Hebrews than ever before

congregated in any city upon earth. To-day we are giving the best we have, and, alas, the worst we have to the bright, black-eyed boys in China and Japan; we are teaching them to heal men scientifically in hospitals and to kill each other scientifically by machine-guns at frightful cost.

The teacher must show what a wonderful time it is to live in, a time of opportunity and responsibility.

Life changes so fast, like a kaleidoscope [he may say], that more has happened in your short lifetime than in all dull Methuselah's or strenuous Julius Cæsar's life. There never was so romantic, so fascinating a time to live in as our own. When a common, poor boy may grow to such influence that he can help shape the course of nations around the globe, the knowledge that was sufficient for the nineteenth century will not suffice for you. You must have not only more knowledge of electricity and aviation and apple-raising, but a great deal more comprehension of that very complex thing, human nature. Misunderstanding of how other people think and feel, and of what is your own real interest means loss of trade and often fearful cost for armaments. Lack of knowledge that God meant this world to be a family of nations has been as costly as the lack of knowledge, up to this age, of microscopic study of microbes, that filth and flies and foul milk meant disease. This is becoming an age of scientific management, and it is high time that we learned not only to lay bricks scientifically, so as to save enormous time and strength, but also learned how to govern, how to live together, and how

to carry on the world's business by scientific management.

The twentieth century child may be taught the three R's in the same way as was the nineteenth century child; but if he is to be fitted for twentieth century politics and business, he must be taught literature, geography, history, and patriotism by a teacher who comprehends the new internationalism. As during the last generation business and world politics have been revolutionised as much as medicine and agriculture and sanitation, the teacher who is in touch with the history that is in the making and who has the spirit of internationalism is alone fitted to lead to-day. He must be in advance of the textbook. No textbook records the most significant word uttered for a decade by the chief executive of a great nation,—that word uttered by President Taft, declaring that all difficulties between nations, including those involving national honour, should be settled by peaceable methods. Only one textbook familiar to me, Meyer's *Modern History*, chronicles, in a chapter on "The World State," the most significant facts in modern history.

The average teacher, overburdened with examination papers and all the new requirements of manual training, physical culture, and nature study, looks askance at any new subject imposed on the crowded curriculum. He fears that we are doing nothing well in consequence of congestion.

Let it therefore be understood that what is needed is not more work, but work modified by a different point of view and a different spirit, which, illuminating the lesson in history or literature or geography, shall inspire the feeling of the Latin poet who said "I count nothing human foreign to me," a spirit which shall banish caste, race prejudice, class prejudice, and national prejudice, and enable the child to deal justly with all mankind. The school must not only interpret this growing consciousness of the family of nations, but must perhaps be the chief instrument in its realisation; for it is largely an intellectual matter and therefore something which neither church nor home is usually fitted to teach so well as the school. Many a man who is devoted to family and church and country is a rank skeptic as to any possibility of ever ending war, and is confident that only a great navy can protect his country from invasion. In school-days a quarter of a century ago, a boy was allowed to grow up with the idea that King George's folly about the colonists was approved by England, that in the Revolution England was a unit and all wrong, and the colonists a unit and all right, and that politeness forbade mentioning Lexington or Independence Day when talking to English friends, lest they be sensitive. Every child should learn, when studying the history of the Revolution, that it was a war between the progressive and retrogressive forces on both sides of the Atlantic. He should be taught that all

English textbooks teach admiration for Washington and condemnation of George III. Had this been properly known in 1895, when a disputed Venezuela boundary-line was the occasion of a week of belligerent talk on our part, it might have saved us the hundred million dollars in foreign investments which it was said that little war-scare cost us. Generations had grown up here crudely considering Englishmen as hereditary foes and that 1776 and 1812 were as significant dates to a great world empire with a thousand years of history as to our new and self-centred republic. Such ignorance, due to bad teaching, is costly in more ways than one; it is evidence of dangerous provincialism.

An outline of a course in "Good Citizenship," now being prepared by the American School Peace League, seems planned to fill a long-felt want. We have been diligent in teaching future voters how to bound Afghanistan and name the tributaries of the Amazon, how to parse participial adjectives and solve problems in cube root; but have we not neglected the weightier matters of the law? We have had no systematic plan in home or school to develop the power of imagination and sympathy and to help immature and prejudiced minds to gain clear perceptions of honour, justice, and obligation. As a result we have a generation of citizens, commonly assumed to be keen and "practical," whose narrow interests and close horizon often bar the vision of their own real good. We

are reputed the world over, often undoubtedly in unjust and exaggerated ways, as being "dollar hunters," more concerned than our neighbours with what is bought and sold and measured in money value. Even eighty years ago Hegel in his *Philosophy of History* remarked upon the preponderance in the United States of *private* interest and maintained that "respect for law exists apart from genuine probity, and the American merchants commonly lie under the imputation of dishonest dealings under legal protection." How are children who daily hear of a "four thousand dollar clergyman," a "five thousand dollar editor," a "ten thousand dollar dinner," a "twenty thousand dollar engagement ring," a "million dollar bride," a "hundred million dollar baby," a "billion dollar captain of high finance," to perceive relative values in other terms than coin? Athletics seems almost the only popular field excepted. How are we to make honour, justice, and good-will the rock on which character is built, when so many children are fed on the garbage of the comic supplement and moving pictures of war and crime?

No thoughtful educator is contented with present educational results, but he has no panacea for the confused thinking, the craze for novelty, the irreverence and flippancy which many American newspapers and homes engender. If even a few minutes every week in every month in our eight years' course, from the primary through the grammar grades, can be given to focusing attention on

the various methods of showing good-will, if this can be done with system and with science, the young men and women of 1925 will be better fitted than the graduates of to-day to distinguish between partisanship and loyalty, between patriotism and jingoism, and between a real enemy and a spook.

In the "Citizenship" course referred to, each month has allotted to it some practical phase of the subject, illustrated with stories and pictures and made clear by cross-questioning to learn the pupil's partial views and enlarge his outlook. At first, good-will is to be shown in its bearing upon the home, school games, and playmates. Later, the same principles of justice, truth, and honour, of sympathy and generosity will be considered in relation to city and country, and, last of all, in the family of nations. The sense of obligation to all the past and to all Asia and Europe will be developed. When the child learns that out of Asia have come all the great religions of the world, that thence came the alphabet, the science of algebra, the invention of printing and gunpowder, etc., that arts flourished there when our ancestors were savages clad in skins; when he hears what Europe has to teach us as to the planning and government of cities, as to education, art, literature and science, postal conveniences, the prevention of fire and accident, etc.; when he hears the names of heroes and statesmen like Bolivar, Sun Yat Sen, and Togo, men of other lands, honoured, he not

only learns mere facts, but will imbibe a lesson of respect and gratitude, wholesome indeed for young America.

Imagination must be developed in our children. Few of their parents have any visual image before their minds when speaking of huge numbers in concrete terms. Millions and billions mean much the same to most intelligent persons.* "As many persons die every day by tuberculosis in this country as were killed in the Messina earthquake," asserted an exceptionally charming and intelligent lady. "Impossible," was the reply, "only one hundred and fifty thousand die annually of that." "Oh, well," she responded, "I suppose I ought to say 'every year' instead of 'every day.' I read

* The following is quoted from the New York *Herald* as an aid to the imagination in attempting to conceive what a "billion" means:

"Where is the human brain that can adequately grasp the vastness of a billion? How many financiers, in speaking casually of a billion-dollar corporation, realise that they are naming a set of figures that, when carefully considered, appalls by its very vastness?

"How many of them know that since the birth of Christ there have but a few more than a billion minutes passed into history? A minute is such a trifling space of time, and a dollar is such a small sum, yet since the beginning of the Christian era there have been but a few more than a billion minutes, and the silver dollars would plate the sides of every warship in the United States Navy.

"At an ordinary valuation of agricultural lands in the best farming sections of the country, a billionaire could buy a farm as large as the combined area of the States of New York, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts. If he could buy land at \$1 an acre, he could purchase all the territory of the United States east of Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico."

so many statistics that it confuses me." This was no fault of memory, but of "sensing" figures. One hears people talk of "billions and billions of people on the globe," with no comprehension that the total population is about one billion and a half. This lack of application of judgment and observation in dealing with figures is largely responsible for the grotesque fear that the world is becoming overpopulated, when all the population of the globe can be put into the State of Texas and allow half an acre per family! The cleverest accountants in adding columns with lightning rapidity are often widest from the mark when attempting to visualise and compare statements of acres, pounds, dollars, or population. Professor Alfred Wallace, the English scientist, well suggested that every school should have one room whose walls should be marked off in tiny squares with a dot in every other one, numbering a million, that would give the little future tax-payers and voters some comprehension of the amount which to-day seems the norm of comparison in the business world, as "thousand" was to our fathers.

An honourable national self-interest must be a great incentive in the new movement justly to formulate national interdependence. The twentieth century youth who is soon to be putting money into South African mines, or who will be employed in filling orders for reapers and ploughs in Russia, for plumbing in Turkey, and electric engines in Persia and China, must be taught that his prosper-

ity depends on peace, and peace depends on justice, and justice depends on far-sighted organisation and treaty provision. He must learn the commercial value of imagination and sympathy as well as its higher ethical value. In the lowest grammar grades, as soon as he can study what our "little cousins" are doing in the Philippines or in Holland or Greece, he must read stories that develop his power to "put himself in the other fellow's place." The Golden Rule would be oftener applied were our complacent eyes able to see how the world looks to the man with the black skin or brown skin or yellow skin, or to the man of our own Caucasian race who, driven by military oppression in the Old World, finds refuge on our shores and sends his little daughter to the fire-trap in a Triangle shirt-waist factory to earn her bread. German success in obtaining trade in South America is due to that power of imagination and shrewd sympathy which studies the customer's language and gives him what he wants when and as he wants it. Our failure thus far in those regions is largely due to assuming that our way of doing is good enough for other people, whether they like it or not. Our business men and drummers have lacked the requisite imagination and sympathy to make the success they might. For instance, in South America women prefer to buy needles encased in scarlet paper. The German discovers the fact and secures orders, while the drummer from the United States loses trade because he offers needles

in our black paper. The American receives orders to ship goods in bags, and, thinking his own methods better, he sends them in boxes, which get broken and cannot be easily carried on mule back,—and then he wonders why he hears nothing further from his customers.

War depends upon the psychology of nations. What are those people thinking in the Mikado's or Kaiser's or Czar's capital, and how many American militarists or men eager for contracts are going to foment mysterious war-scares? How many credulous readers can we count on believing these war-scares valid? That is the main problem,—not how many dreadnoughts have we or they. As a nation fears or suspects, so is its burden of military taxation. As the boy stores up impressions, prejudices, sympathies, so the man legislates and the nation makes friends or foes.

The responsibility of the teacher was never so great to do what church and home and Sunday-school all often neglect—inspire a friendly instead of a suspicious attitude toward the world. The teacher must know far more than he can definitely teach of internationalism, if the school is to have the right atmosphere and his pupils attain the right point of view that will stand them in stead when national hysteria prevails. He should read two books,—David Starr Jordan's *The Human Harvest*, a complete refutation of the fallacy that "war promotes virility," and *The Great Illusion*, by Norman Angell.

The prime necessity is to secure a teacher whose patriotism will put conscience and enthusiasm into teaching those character-building lessons of infinitely more value to every child than any technical book-lore the schools can give him. In the primary grades, stories of knights fighting dragons, of firemen fighting flames, of heroes saving life will be substituted for tales of war, in teaching the "Good Citizenship" course. Later, in history classes, wars must be studied; but if emphasis is laid on the causes and cost and results of wars and not on campaigns; if copies of Verestchagin's mournful pictures of war and clear statements of its squalor and horrors are presented briefly, the glamour of the "splendid charge" will not dim the child's insight into the true nature of war. Statistics of huge losses mean nothing to immature minds; a few pathetic or realistic stories of individual loss are more impressive. But some faint conception of the appalling cost of armaments may be given the arithmetic classes by setting them to figure out how many schools like their own could be built at the cost of one short-lived dreadnought costing \$12,000,000, or how many children could have suits of clothes for one shot costing \$1700 at target practice.

In higher grades should be taught in simple form the results of modern banking and investment; how under the new conditions, no nation can conquer another and not lose more than it could gain. It must be pointed out that this was not always so,

but that modern investments and banking, which depend so largely upon credit and confidence, have altered all former conditions. Should a German army invade England (Von Moltke said he knew three ways of getting one in, but not one of getting it out) and should it destroy the Bank of England and confiscate its gold, a "run" would presently follow on every bank in Great Britain and they would suspend payments, as Norman Angell has well shown. Merchants the world over would face ruin and call in their credits in Germany and thus undermine German finance. German trade would be paralysed, and a thousand marks would be lost for every one confiscated. If twenty-five years ago the rumour of a probable failure of the Barings created consternation and was a theme for special prayers in American churches, how vastly more would the much-talked-of war between Germany and England bring chaos on Wall Street to-day and affect every village in the land! That war can never be permitted if for no other reason than that for the business world it spells disaster. The thought of it would never have gained ground had the business world not been under the obsession of antiquated notions of economics. These notions are expressed naively in old phraseology about defence, which to-day does not apply.

The youngest child should be taught Franklin's adage that "The worst thing you can do to a customer is to knock him on the head." We are all customers and sellers to-day, and the world is our

market. We can no more separate our success from others' success than hand and foot or lungs and heart can ignore each other. Trade does not follow the flag, as every economist knows. England's huge navy does not avail to sell one more screw-driver. Her carrying trade is hardly more *per capita* than one third of Norway's. She has become land poor in taking, within a generation, as much territory and population as those of the whole United States. She must police most of this, yet gets not enough revenue to pay for the policing. No foreign nation can gain anything to-day by the conquest of another nation's colonies, and no people in a protectionist country are likely to gain by a war-indemnity. Preposterous as it may seem, the French indemnity did much to demoralise Germany, and financial depression occurred from 1872 to 1880. Ten years after Sedan, France was more prosperous than Germany.

May it not yet appear that for the attainment of success in modern business a little knowledge of relations between the family of nations is of as much practical utility for our young men as anything thus far discovered in schools of commerce or technology? The sophomore is quite as likely to hold antiquated notions about dangers and defence as his grandmother does about athletics or chemistry. The class-room should teach him the latest advance in internationalism as it does in biology.

CHAPTER XII

PATRIOTIC SONGS, SYMBOLS, AND SOCIETIES

"I CARE not who makes the laws of a country, if I may write its songs," is the oft-quoted dictum of one who knew the relation of cause and effect in history. It was a music hall ditty,

We don't want to fight,
But, by jingo, if we do,
We 've got the ships,
We 've got the men,
We 've got the money, too,

which a generation ago inflamed the English people and had tremendous weight in creating war sentiment. It is a matter for consideration whether children throughout our land are to be taught that "conquer we must, for our cause it is just." Even if the word "when" is substituted for "for," the error is as great. It is a survival of the mediæval superstition that the victim thrown into the river who could float was not guilty and that Elsa's innocence could be proved by the valiant sword of Lohengrin. War is but a gigantic duel; the stronger and more skilful

wins, regardless of justice. We won the Mexican War, not because we were right, but because we were strong, as the Assyrians conquered the Jews for the same reason. Success is almost always on the side of "the heaviest battalions" in any war. Children who grow up with the ingrained notion that their country must always be right and, therefore, always successful become the zealots and hot-heads who foment other wars.

The Star Spangled Banner has been selected by the army and navy as *the* national anthem, and a thoughtless public seems to assume that this is conclusive and the question is not to be reopened. So jealous are certain persons for the pre-eminence of this particular song, that one almost runs the risk of being called unpatriotic if he is heretical enough to question it. But the decision of the small body of army and navy officials, though somewhat influential in shaping public opinion, can settle nothing. The rulers of the republic, the people, must decide whether this song, written for a special time and place in the War of 1812, is to be their chief expression of national faith. *The Star Spangled Banner* is far from being great poetry, and it is vocally difficult—the people cannot sing it. These two defects should prevent its adoption as *the* national song. But it is also unsuited to many hours and places. At sunset, when the flag is lowered, is it not rather absurd to ask, "O, say, can you see by the dawn's early light"? The song deals with one incident, and

that a war incident. "The perilous night" was one special and comparatively unimportant night in our history. Whatever is special or local or refers to facts not generally known is not suited for a national anthem, to be learned by heart, to be sung by millions of all classes, to shape the national ideals of a powerful people. As during our whole history we have been at war less than one tenth of the time, war should not be the sole topic referred to in our chief national anthem.

"My country," "sweet land of liberty," "freedom's holy light," "our fathers' God" are nobler and more universal themes than "the rocket's red glare, the bombs bursting in air." To-day, *America* is undeniably the American people's dearest national hymn as the *Battle Hymn of the Republic* is the most inspiring and poetic in its verse, and Eichberg's *To Thee O Country*, presents the noblest music. Why should not the army respect the feeling of the people rather than the people obey the behest of a few army officers? Let this purely military song of the *The Star Spangled Banner* be retained in the repertoire of military bands, and be sung sometimes with various other national songs, like *Hail Columbia*; but let the great body of teachers, preachers, editors, the mothers, and the civic patriots of our land choose as *the* national anthem a song which does not ignore the interests, life, and faith of a great Christian people. That *America* is sung to a tune of German origin, which is also used as the

national air of our "kin beyond sea," and by the Swiss as well, does not condemn it but rather gives an honourable historic ancestry for the national anthem of a great cosmopolitan people like our own. One of the most thrilling experiences of many sea voyages has been the rising at the close of the ship's concert and singing that air, common to both countries, each passenger singing the words of his own land. National anthems cannot be written to order: they must evolve. We may be long in finding the ideal one; England has not yet found hers. But let no silly shame because of the present doubt as to what our chief anthem shall be, hasten us to accept an unrepresentative and inadequate one.

The exaggerated attention given to the symbol of our country, so noticeable in the last few years, is in keeping with the exaggerated attention to all that is external and spectacular in modern life. The most sacred symbols of religion have in times past become such fetiches that for a time all who loved the thought for which they stood more than the symbols have discarded them. There is danger of a Puritan revolution sometime against patriotic symbols, if the symbol is allowed to become a fetich and the real thing for which it stands is overshadowed by it.

An illustration of the extreme attention to a symbol was shown in the action of a certain society of patriotic women some years ago on the occasion of the arrest of a poor foreigner who was

carrying home potatoes wrapped in an old flag. The bewilderment of this man, who was obliged to pay a large share of his week's wages as fine for this act which, in his ignorance of the law, had seemed to him so innocent, did not appeal to these "patriots." The heroism of the policeman who had performed the brave deed of arrest they thought worthy to be honoured, and accordingly they arranged the presentation of a cup and flag, with an accompanying eulogy, as if he had risked his life in capturing a thug.

In a certain Patriotic Primer, in a long catechism for children upon the flag, we find the pupils called to state in answer to questions that the flag must be of "all wool bunting or silk." "The union must be one third the length of the flag, extending to the bottom of the fourth red stripe." "The flag was first raised over Fort Stanwix, on the present site of the city of Rome, N. Y., August 2, 1777. The first salute ever given in a foreign country was on February 14, 1778. There were sixty-four designs made before the Stars and Stripes were adopted," etc. Betsy Ross is frequently mentioned on Flag Day, and children are taught that the first flag was made out of a soldier's white shirt, an old blue army coat, and a red petticoat. It is well enough to record these facts, but they are not important, not the kind of facts to emphasise. Is there not danger in patriotism as well as in religion of tithing mint and anise and cummin and forgetting to emphasise the weightier matters?

Let the teacher on Flag Day discuss symbols in general and Aristotle's definition of man as a "symbol making animal." Not only the wedding ring, the communion cup, the cross, the star and crescent, the Freemason's symbols, the bush before the inn, the barber's pole, the pawnbroker's gold balls, the dove, the olive leaf, and the scales of justice might be used as illustrations, but it should be shown that every car ticket and bank-note and every word or figure is a symbol, as it stands for an idea. The flags of other countries should be mentioned, and the pupils' attention called to the fact that Norway, France, and several other countries besides ours have flags of red, white, and blue. Richard Le Gallienne's stirring poem on "War" well brings out the power of symbols and music, the soullessness often behind them, and the need of penetrating to their easy deceptions.

War

I abhor;

And yet how sweet

The sound along the marching street

Of drum and fife, and I forget

Broken old mothers, and the whole

Dark butchering without a soul.

Without a soul—save this bright treat

Of heady music, sweet as hell;

And even my peace-abiding feet

Go marching with the marching street,

For yonder goes the fife,
And what care I for human Life;
The tears fill my astonished eyes,
 And my full heart is like to break,
And yet it is embannered lies,
 A dream those drummers make.

Oh, it is wickedness to clothe
 Yon hideous, grinning thing that stalks
Hidden in music, like a queen
 That in a garden of glory walks,
Till good men love the things they loathe;
Art, thou hast many infamies,
But not an infamy like this.

There are in the United States to-day scores of thousands of American citizens of privileged birth, descendants of the early founders of our country and of those who fought for its independence, who have joined societies which pass under the common title of "Patriotic." The members are not wholly responsible for that general title given by the public, as their avowed purpose is to concern themselves peculiarly with the reminiscential aspects of patriotism and to honour worthy ancestors. Their study has been valuable in preserving colonial relics and traditions, in instituting antiquarian research, and in bringing about greater reverence than we otherwise might have for the farmer and artisan who left the plough and shop in '76 to fight for independence. Had one the genial wit of Howells, one might venture to discuss some

of the results of patriotic activity in these organisations without giving offence. But perhaps it is possible for an ordinary descendant of Revolutionary ancestors to say an earnest word to her compatriots that may be helpful and suggestive and not be deemed impertinent or unfriendly. If the Father of his country were to address to-day the descendants of his old comrades of the days that tried men's souls, what would he say? Doubtless he would congratulate these men and women as belonging to a small class of the most privileged people who have ever lived and he would perhaps contrast the limitations of the women of his time with the large leisure of many of these women of to-day. Perhaps he might point out that the test of culture and character is the use of leisure. Great organisations of these men and women, privileged by birth, tradition, culture, and large freedom in the disposal of their time, are now being tested as to their patriotism; and might he not inquire whether many outside their organisations are not showing far more willingness to serve their country than those whose credentials admit them to these honoured bodies whose power for patriotic work is unrivalled? What would the heroes of '76 who fought with him be doing to serve their country were they alive in this year when the McNamaras and a half-dozen bloated trusts have been on trial and when the startling power of the "I.W.W.," Pittsburg surveys and Ohio bribery, and Pennsylvania's impotence to

punish a savage burning at the stake within her borders present problems quite as serious as ever did the Stamp Act and Writs of Assistance? May not loyalty to the memory of these

stalwart old iconoclasts,
Unconvinced by ax or gibbet that all virtue was the
past's,

best express itself to-day not by looking backward, but by looking forward as they did and putting a strong hand to the present task? Granted, as of course we all do, that the work of reminiscential patriotism has a proper place; are not our "sons" and "daughters" and "dames" too often in danger of overdoing this side of the matter? Memorials to the Revolutionary heroes are admirable when wrought in bronze or marble, but they have just as much to do with patriotism, and no more, as statues of the apostles have to do with religion. Let us erect them; let us have parliamentary law niceties and bunting; let us have genealogies and epitaphs; let us present loving-cups, and listen to recitations and eulogies and violin solos, and eat pink ices, and have exhibitions of Colonial samplers and pewter mugs; let us cultivate antiquarianism, genealogical research, and social intercourse; but, in the name of the forefathers who made real sacrifices for the country they loved, let us not call ourselves "patriots" unless we add to these harmless and agreeable functions somewhat more

definite, serious work in service, in doing what these men would do were they here to-day and were they confronting the insidious and terrible dangers of prosperity and wealth as nobly as they once confronted poverty and obloquy.

If patriotic women would honour the great citizens of the past, let them imbibe their spirit of devotion; let them see to it that every boy and girl who grows up in their town knows the meaning of good citizenship and service of country at the primaries and polls; let them see to it that, through schools and clubs and festival days, they learn that patriotism is not shown by hating red-coats or exploding cannon-crackers at midnight of the glorious Fourth, or by mere salutations of the flag. The greatest service of patriots to the country is to teach a nobler and truer meaning of the word "patriotism." It is a hopeful sign that one of the patriotic societies of women, the "Colonial Daughters of American Founders and Patriots," proposes to "make citizenship a subject of definite study" and has undertaken education and propaganda upon "the conservation and economic development of the natural resources of the nation" and kindred subjects. Some other societies claim to have the same purpose of emphasising this far more than they yet have done.

The young woman as well as the young man must be inspired to chivalric mood; she should see in her club work, her church work, her home life and vocation avenues of patriotic service worthy

the spirit of devotion and faithfulness of a Jeanne d'Arc or of a Florence Nightingale. As women are the buyers and educators, they set the standard of living and the ideals of the child. They largely control the standards of amusements. They can practically control race prejudice and the tendency to a caste system, which always conduce to special privilege and militarism. We need women with a patriotism which is equal to sacrificing bridge whist parties in order to teach little immigrant citizens, not colonial history, which they can learn at school, but the best American standards of wholesome living. We need *débutantes* with a patriotism which is equal to some sacrifice of the parties and pleasure of the privileged for the help of masses whose poverty, or ignorance, or disease menaces the republic. We need women of leisure who will bring to the busy men who earn their bread something of the vision and wide outlook over national problems which their clubs and reading ought to furnish. Probably the best patriotic work among women's organisations to-day is being done by the women's clubs, though they do not label their work as patriotic. But whoever works against child labour and for conservation, education, and good citizenship is doing the highest form of patriotic service. A patriotism which will sacrifice as much for concrete countrymen as for an abstract idea called country is too rare among professional patriots. With a population in this country nearly half of foreign

parentage, and largely unacquainted with our literature, traditions, and political principles, it would seem as if the prime duty of patriots to-day was to enlighten these newcomers and lend a helping hand, with care not to patronise those who are counted as genuinely citizens as ourselves. Some organisations of patriotic women in Connecticut, by publishing common-sense advice to immigrants in their own language, have suggested a line of work which more might follow. What does the average Slav or Greek in Lowell mills or the Italian or Russian Jew in Chicago slums most need to make him an American patriot? Is it stereopticon lectures on the battles of the Brandywine or Bennington, sometimes provided from "the chapter's" funds? Is it not, first of all, that personal friendliness which can alone bridge the chasm which yawns between culture, and ignorance, between privilege and privation? Is it not that spirit of democracy which goes an arrow's flight above *noblesse oblige* and welcomes as potential bringers of gifts these toilers from the lands of Socrates, Dante, and Tolstoi?

Just as the Church has awakened to perceive that it must have a forward movement and present a new and larger conception of Christianity, if it is still to nourish the great mass of common folk, so those of English blood who cherish the principles of the founders of the republic must awake to see that, unless a red-blooded, twentieth-century patriotism which demands present courage and

sacrifice be better understood by all our "patriots," these principles may be unconsciously and ignorantly repudiated by the next generation of a population which marks our country as the melting-pot of nations.

CHAPTER XIII

THE PROGRESS OF ARBITRATION

SINCE John Jay was burned in effigy in Boston for putting an arbitration clause into our treaty with England in 1794 there have been about 350 international disputes settled by arbitration or by special commissions. It is a fact of extraordinary historic interest that in no instance has a nation that pledged itself to arbitrate ever broken its pledge and gone to war. In one instance there was a compromise, and in another mediation prevented war. From 1814 to 1840 there were only 24 such settlements; but the rate of increase was so rapid that in 1901, 1902, and 1903 there were 63. Since then there have been about 130 general treaties of arbitration signed, and France and England, unfriendly for centuries, have quietly settled by diplomacy a half dozen difficulties any one of which in former days might have led to war. The mere fact of a world court being ready to hear disputes will cause many cases to be settled out of court.

All cases except those recently sent to the Permanent Tribunal of Arbitration at The Hague

were settled by the various nations through special courts arranged for the occasion. Hereafter, the Permanent Tribunal will settle the most of such cases until the Court of Arbitral Justice, agreed on at the Second Hague Conference, has its judges appointed and is formally established. Nations then will have their choice between the two and may arbitrate or submit their cases to a permanent court of law.

America had the honour of opening the Hague Court. The first case sent to it was the "Pious Fund" case between the United States and Mexico. The second was the Venezuela case, to which eleven nations were parties; the third case, concerning the House tax, was between Japan and England, France and Germany; the fourth, the Muscat case, was between England and France; the fifth, between Germany and France, over the Casa Blanca case; the sixth, between Norway and Sweden, over their maritime frontier; the seventh, between Great Britain and the United States, over the Atlantic fisheries; the eighth, between the United States and Venezuela, over the question of the Orinoco Steam Navigation Company; the ninth, between Great Britain and France, over the case of Savarkar. The last three cases have involved respectively, Russia and Turkey, Italy and Peru, France and Italy. Other questions are on the docket of the Hague Tribunal to be tried; and many more have been or are to be tried by special tribunals.

In 1897, a treaty of arbitration arranged between the United States and Great Britain was defeated by a minority of the Senate. Three senators, whose combined constituents amounted in number to less than the population of Chicago, succeeded in defeating the necessary two thirds vote, thereby thwarting the will of the great majority of the people of two nations. Extraneous questions, like that of Home Rule, which agitated the Irish element in America, helped toward this defeat, which was a world calamity. In 1911, President Taft secured the acceptance by Great Britain and France of arbitration treaties which covered all justiciable questions, thus no longer excluding those of vital interest and honour which had limited our previous treaties with twenty-four nations. He declared his own willingness to leave the question of justiciability to the Hague Tribunal itself, but in deference to existing conservatism he felt the time for this was not ripe. A provision was therefore made in the treaty that a High Commission of Inquiry, of six members, should consider the justiciability of a case if it were called in question by one of the nations party to the treaty, and that if five of the six so agreed the case should be considered justiciable. The extraordinary outburst of enthusiasm with which the proposal for this treaty was hailed in Great Britain was a revelation of the immense interest taken by the highest dignitaries of Church and State as well as by the rank and file of Englishmen

in prospect of a noble culmination to the hundred years of peace between Great Britain and the United States. A campaign of education lasting six months was begun in the United States upon the publication of a majority report of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate which raised technical objections and would have emasculated the treaties. Never was the Senate so besieged by petitions and letters from boards of trade, churches, and all kinds of organisations, in favour of these treaties. Germany seemed ready to sign a similar treaty; and it was evident that, if these treaties were accepted without amendment, it would probably be possible to secure similar ones within ten years with every nation upon the earth. By the casting of one single vote the specified function of the High Commission was thrown out; and the treaties were otherwise weakened in dignity and proper form. The result was due to a division on party lines. Had not partisanship been rife, owing to the high feeling incident to a presidential election, or had absent supporters of the treaty been present, this second calamity might have been avoided. As a result, four nations have been thwarted in making an unparalleled advance toward world peace and justice which would have placed the United States upon a moral eminence and made it the bold leader of the nations. Said Lord Weardale, president of the Interparliamentary Union, when the news reached London:

The Senate has definitely struck a blow at the whole position of leadership in advancing arbitration which the United States took when President Taft boldly proposed the draft of a convention which though negotiated with England and France was open to all other powers. I shall be surprised if the American people do not shortly realise the unfortunate circumstances which have defeated the great civilising purpose on which I have not a doubt the great majority of them have been anxiously intent.

To this brief glance at the general course of arbitration may be added a special survey of what has been accomplished in Latin America.

It is to Simon Bolivar, the Washington of South America, that five nations owe their freedom from the thralldom of Spain. A statesman of the broadest views, in the second decade of the last century he arranged five treaties with as many nations in which there was provision for arbitration of differences rising between them. He called the first Pan-American Peace Congress in 1826, at which the four nations which attended pledged themselves to "amicably compromise all differences now existing or which may arise in the future." Though these pledges were not ratified, their influence was later evident in the many treaties which provided for arbitration. In the constitutions of Venezuela, Brazil, Ecuador, San Domingo, and the states of Central America appear provisions for efforts for arbitration before declaring war. In the constitution of Brazil it is

decreed that no territory shall ever be taken by conquest.

In 1900, Chile and Argentina were on the point of war about a boundary line, when, on Easter Sunday, Bishop Benavente of Cuyo in Argentina pleaded with his people not to disgrace their common religion and common blood by fratricidal war. A Chilean bishop followed his example, and they travelled through their respective countries imploring peace and arbitration. Better counsels prevailed. The question was submitted to King Edward of England, and the decision was rendered in 1902, but before its announcement agreement had been made for limitation of armaments. In 1903, Chile and Argentina signed the first arbitration treaty that covered all cases. Through interest fostered by the women of the two countries, led by Señora da Costa, president of the Christian Mothers Association of Buenos Aires, a colossal statue of the Christ, cast from old cannon, was taken up 13,000 feet, beyond the highest point where the railroads cross the Andes, and there, on a lofty pedestal, was unveiled before thousands who had made the ascent to witness the moving spectacle. Beneath the outstretched hand extended over the border line, where might have stood frowning fortresses, were read these words: "Sooner shall these mountains crumble into dust than Argentines and Chileans break the peace to which they have pledged themselves at the feet of Christ the Redeemer."

In 1907, Chile and Peru brought about at the Second Hague Conference an agreement that one of two interested parties to a dispute might inform the Hague Tribunal of its willingness to arbitrate. At the Second Hague Conference, in 1907, Dr. Drago of Argentina, M. Ruy Barbosa of Brazil, and M. Triana of Colombia took a leading part in shaping the action of the Conference.

In 1907, a remarkable step forward was taken by the five tumultuous republics of Central America, owing to the initiative of the United States and Mexico. A conference called in Washington by Secretary Root met November 14th, and achieved a triumph for peace. After a session of five weeks eight treaties were signed. The conventions agreed to were for the establishment of a Central American Court of Justice; for the establishment of an international Central American Bureau; for a general treaty of peace and amity; for communications pertaining to railroads and waterways; for extradition; for the establishment of a Central American Pedagogical Institute; and for future Central American conferences.

A Central American Court of Justice was forthwith established and opened May 25, 1908, "for the purpose of efficaciously guaranteeing their rights and maintaining peace and harmony unalterably in their relations without being obliged to resort in any case to the employment of force." Twice since then war has been averted by reference to this court and, though there has been much

internal disorder in some of these states, in **no** instance has there been strife between them. Though the noble building erected for the court as a gift by Mr. Carnegie has been destroyed by earthquake, another, also provided by him, takes its place. The provision also made for an international school in which teachers from the five states shall be educated is a further guarantee of good understanding and good-will and perhaps of the first step in the ultimate federation of five weak nations into one strong one. Argentina and Brazil united with the United States in recent years in acting as mediators, under that provision of the Hague Conference in 1899 which enabled President Roosevelt to mediate between Japan and Russia, and which brought peace between Peru and Ecuador when they were involved in serious dispute about a boundary, which dispute seemed likely to involve three of their neighbours as well.

CHAPTER XIV

HOPEFUL NEW AGENCIES FOR PEACE

BENEFACTORS OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT

IN 1896, Alfred Nobel of Sweden, the inventor of dynamite, died, leaving a provision that most of his great fortune should go to establish five annual prizes, amounting to nearly forty thousand dollars each, to be given to such persons as had done the most important work for literature, chemistry, physics, medicine, and peace. The first four prizes are awarded by the Swedish authorities, the peace prize by a committee appointed by the Norwegian Storting. A Nobel Institute was established in Christiania, whither the winner of the peace prize each year is to repair and deliver an address. The provision for a peace prize was due to the influence of Nobel's friend, Baroness von Suttner of Vienna, author of *Lay Down Your Arms*, a book translated into many languages, which with her many other writings and addresses have made her a leading factor in the peace movement for the last thirty years. The list of recipients of the Nobel peace prizes are:

- 1901. H. Dunant, founder of the Red Cross Society, and Frederic Passy of Paris, Nestor of the peace movement.
- 1902. E. Ducommun and A. Gobat, successive secretaries of the International Peace Bureau at Berne.
- 1903. W. Randall Cremer, founder of the Inter-Parliamentary Union.
- 1904. Institute of International Law.
- 1905. The Baroness von Suttner.
- 1906. Theodore Roosevelt.
- 1907. L. Renault of France and E. T. Moneta of Italy.
- 1908. K. P. Arnoldson of Sweden and Frederick Bajer of Denmark.
- 1909. M. A. Beernaert of Belgium and Baron d'Estournelles de Constant of France.
- 1910. The International Peace Bureau.
- 1911. T. M. C. Asser of Holland and Alfred Fried of Vienna, editor of the *Friedenswarte*.

Never perhaps has so great a cause struggled with so slight material support as the peace cause during the last century. Only in this latest time have generous friends come forward with financial assistance in some degree commensurate with the needs of the movement.

The first man to pledge a large amount to the propagandism of peace was Mr. Edwin Ginn, the well-known publisher of Boston. In November, 1910, his "World Peace Foundation," previously known as the "International School of Peace," was incorporated, with provision for \$50,000 a

year and an ultimate endowment of \$1,000,000. It has a strong body of trustees and able directors. President David Starr Jordan of Leland Stanford University is one of the directors. The managing director is Edwin D. Mead. This Foundation publishes the International Library, the most important series of peace books now existing, and multitudes of pamphlets. It addresses itself broadly to the educational side of peace work. It is organising a department for special work in colleges and universities; it aids the School Peace League; and it co-operates with the movements among students. Dr. Nasmyth's splendid work in the European universities is sustained by it. It provides for lectures in schools, colleges, and churches; it maintains a special department for work among the women's organisations of the country; and it supplies much material for the press and for all classes of peace workers.

Mr. Ginn's endowment was followed in December, 1910, by the announcement of a gift by Andrew Carnegie of \$10,000,000 to establish the "Carnegie Endowment for International Peace." This gift followed Mr. Carnegie's previous gifts of \$1,500,000 for the Peace Palace at The Hague, of \$5,000,000 for Heroes of Peace in America, \$1,250,000 in Great Britain, \$1,000,000 in France, \$1,250,000 in Germany, and \$1,790,000 in smaller countries for the same purpose. Mr. Carnegie also gave \$850,000 for the building and beautification of the grounds of the Pan-American Union in

Washington, and \$100,000 for the erection of the Central American Court in Costa Rica. It should also be remembered that Mr. Carnegie, at the time of our paying Spain \$20,000,000 as a quit-claim for the Philippines, in his strong desire to prevent us from adopting the imperial policy and demanding sovereignty over an unwilling people, offered to pay the \$20,000,000 himself if we would leave the Filipinos independent. The government's refusal ended in war and the killing of more Filipinos than Spain had killed in its three hundred years of domination.

The headquarters of the Carnegie Endowment are in Washington. The twenty-seven able business men and statesmen whom Mr. Carnegie appointed, with Senator Root as chairman, have elected Dr. James Brown Scott, formerly of the State Department, as secretary and director of its department of international law. The director of its department of economics and history is Professor John B. Clarke of Columbia University. In August, 1911, Professor Clarke convened in Berne, Switzerland, a conference of eighteen economists of different countries, including the former minister of state for the treasury of Japan. An Austrian economist was chosen chairman; and three lines of investigation were marked out, the first ever attempted on the basis of international co-operation. Commission I. will deal with the causes and effects of wars. Its inquiries will be made into the protectionist policy; international

loans; rivalry among states with respect to capitalist investments in foreign countries; the conditions of and extension of conscription; economic effects of the right of capture; war loans by neutral countries; financial cost of war and its effects; loss of human life in war; influence of the open door policy; and numerous other similar subjects. Commission II. deals with armaments in time of peace, and will make researches regarding causes of armaments, modern inventions affecting war, traffic in arms, etc. Commission III. will deal with new influences in international life, and will study to what extent the economic life of individual nations has ceased to be self-contained and the causes which are bringing about the greater interdependence of nations. The final results of all these investigations, which are to be carried on at length by specialists, will give a vast amount of scientific information upon which college textbooks and future legislation may be based. The agreements of impartial experts, rather than prejudice and hearsay, will doubtless thus have influence on press and pulpit and in time affect all public thought. The third department of the endowment is devoted to intercourse and education, and is under the directorship at present of President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University. This department sustains the International Conciliation Association, has allotted certain sums to existing peace societies and to the International Peace Bureau at Berne, has arranged an interchange

of lectureships with South American universities and peace missions to the East, has established European headquarters in Paris, and is planning work in many important fields.

The combined generous gifts of Mr. Carnegie and Mr. Ginn supply the cost of one battleship to promote international peace. Large as the sum appears, it is far less than is needed to carry out the plans for the education and organisation which shall remove the grievous military burdens of the world. An immediate falling off of small annual subscriptions, due to a false impression that these gifts would accomplish all that was needed, was evident at first, and it therefore seems important to emphasise the need of constant increase of funds for the peace cause. With the exception of the notable gifts above mentioned, far more has been given by the general public for the prevention of cruelty to animals than for the abolition of the slaughter of human beings in war.

One of the most notable of great benefactors of the cause of peace is Albert K. Smiley, the genial and noble octogenarian, who every year since 1895 has generously entertained as his guests for a three days' conference in the springtime, hundreds of the most busy and eminent men of all professions and large business interests. The Mohonk Arbitration Conference, held in the great assembly parlour of his hotel, devotes morning and evening sessions to the presentation of every subject connected with the judicial settlement of

international difficulties. Among its presiding officials for years at a time have been such men as Senator Edmunds, Hon. John W. Foster, Judge George Gray, and President Butler of Columbia University. In the early days, the most notable figure at the conferences was the author of *The Man Without a Country*, as intense in his international enthusiasms as in his love of country. At the first session, in 1895, he sounded the watchword which he reiterated with emphasis year after year: "We must have a permanent Tribunal of Arbitration—a permanent Tribunal—a permanent Tribunal." At the session in 1896, an eminent diplomat rejoined to this demand of Dr. Hale's that it was "not probable that for many years to come the governments would accept any such ideal." Others also uttered words of scepticism; but in less than half a dozen years the Hague Conference had been held, the conventions signed, and nearly all ratified, the Hague Tribunal opened, and its first case decided! At his last presence at Mohonk in 1907, the venerable prophet, with keen insight into present needs, called for the step demanded for that day, the limitation of armaments. He spoke from experience in Washington and with emphasis upon the insidious influence of capitalists who make fortunes out of great navies.

Among the notable participants in these unique conferences have been Justice Brewer, Cardinal Gibbons, Hon. Oscar S. Straus, Hon. Andrew

D. White, President Charles W. Eliot, Wu Ting Fang, Hague Court judges, and a host of captains of industry, bankers, governors, diplomats, authors, eminent clergymen, and distinguished guests from Europe, Asia, and South America. From year to year these conferences have grown more and more serious and weighty, and their influence has been far-reaching. Boards of Trade have sent delegates from the great cities all over the country, and admirals and generals have been welcomed as well as civilians. Not the least profitable feature of the meetings has been the delightful hours of recreation, when, in drives or walks or boating on the little lake which lies in a deep pocket between rugged cliffs, men of wide experience informally exchange their thoughts upon the great matters that have been discussed.

THE AMERICAN SCHOOL PEACE LEAGUE

There is nothing more encouraging in the peace movement to-day than the extent to which it is entering the field of education; for it has been well said that the cause which captures youth captures the future. Two of the most promising of these new educational agencies will be briefly noticed, the School Peace League and the Cosmopolitan Clubs. The American School Peace League is the most complete educational organisation in the world to prepare the rising generation for modern international relations, for a broader

spirit of patriotism, and for the organisation of the family of nations. Its origin was in the First National Peace Congress, held in 1907, when Carnegie Hall, in New York City, was crowded one afternoon with thousands of youthful delegates from public and private schools, all wearing special badges and coming with pencils and note-books to listen to the distinguished speakers and the great chorus and to report to their respective classes. This meeting, presided over by the Superintendent of Schools of New York, Mr. Maxwell, gave evidence of such unbounded interest and enthusiasm that Baron d'Estournelles de Constant, who was one of the speakers, declared that it had given him more hope for the peace cause than anything else he had ever seen.

A committee was appointed to arrange permanent work in the schools; and a year later, Mrs. Fannie Fern Andrews of Boston, a college woman with a genius for organisation, whose devotion to the peace cause has since led to her election as a member of the Berne Bureau, was secured to act as secretary of the new League and began the work of enlisting the aid of the educators of America in arousing the teachers and normal students to the important educational aspects of the peace movement. To-day the League has upwards of forty State branches, with officers, besides local branches; it is endorsed by the National Education Association, and always holds its annual meetings in connection with the As-

sociation's conventions. So far as its funds—which aside from an annual contribution from the World Peace Foundation are wholly from private subscription—admit, it supplies free literature and speakers, and it is doing its utmost to improve textbooks in history and the teaching of history and patriotism. In order to reach adequately the 450,000 teachers of our country the League would require an annual income of \$50,000.

Its president is Superintendent James H. Van Sickle of Springfield, Mass. Its work is strongly supported by Professor Claxton, United States Commissioner of Education at Washington, who has efficiently co-operated with it in sending to all the school superintendents of the country special material to be used in the wide-spread observance in the schools of the anniversary of the opening of the First Hague Conference on May 18th. On this day, an hour is set apart for special consideration of arbitration as a substitute for war, and the story of the Hague Conferences is told as a matter of historic importance, marking a new era in the world's history. The League offers annually the Seabury prizes amounting in all to \$300, which are given to the writers of the three best essays on some prescribed aspect of the peace cause who are seniors in normal schools and in secondary schools in Europe and the United States. The efforts of the League to establish the study of "Good Citizenship" in the schools have been outlined in another chapter.

Hopeful New Agencies for Peace 209

The English School Peace League, whose presidency was taken by the eminent Bishop of Hereford, was organised in 1910. Its headquarters are with the National Peace Council, St. Stephen's House, Westminster, London. The American secretary, in three European tours, has laid the foundation of an International Council for the leagues and has won much official support. Count Apponyi, the well-known Hungarian statesman, Sir Michael Sadler of England, the eminent educator, M. Ferdinand Buisson of France, former Secretary of Education, are among the limited number of councillors who will represent their respective countries on this Council. The plan of work of both national and international character involves the appointment of well-paid directors of departments of propaganda, speakers, press, publications, and history. The aim is to secure the establishment of a School Peace League in every land and through the International Council to co-ordinate the work, standardise the teaching of history, and promote correspondence between students of different nations and the interchange of lectures. The scheme is comprehensive and admirably adapted to educational conditions, for the work is mainly in the hands of educators rather than of professional peace advocates. The aim will be not to increase the work of teachers, but to help them to teach geography, history, literature, patriotism, and especially economics from the point of view demanded by the needs of the twentieth century.

COSMOPOLITAN CLUBS

A movement of great promise is that of the Cosmopolitan Clubs, which, from a little club of students in 1903, has developed into a powerful body of between two and three thousand students in some thirty of our American universities, representing about fifty different countries. Baron d'Estournelles has aptly styled these clubs "miniature Hague Conferences." The modest beginning was in the apartment of a young Japanese student in the University of Wisconsin, where was founded an International Club composed of sixteen foreign and two native students. Almost simultaneously and quite independently similar clubs were founded at Cornell, Michigan, and Illinois universities. Although clubs composed of foreigners of some one nationality were previously common, the idea of a club in which students of various nations should intermingle was new, and at first excited scepticism as to its success. But as a result of these attempts born of faith and good-will, the Wisconsin club of eighteen has grown to eighty-five, representing twenty countries. The contagion of faith and good-will has rapidly spread; and in 1907, an American Association of Cosmopolitan Clubs was formed. Its early illustrated annuals were a revelation of a mighty new power for international fraternity within our midst. As one studies in detail the faces of these picked men in some club group, future leaders of science and politics in China,

Japan, Brazil, Mexico, India, the Philippines, South Africa, and other lands, as well as the frank, alert faces of our native collegians, one realises that this club, like similar ones elsewhere, is a melting-pot for the elimination of whatever prejudice, suspicion, and indifference may have once lurked in them. To-day these men from all quarters of the globe, by the common bond of intellectual interests and common recreation, are coming, without any loss of patriotism as concerns their native lands, to think of themselves first of all as citizens of the world, members of the brotherhood of man. "Above all nations is humanity," the striking utterance of Goldwin Smith, is the motto of the Association, well chosen and far-reaching in its influence upon other clubs of narrow limitations. President Eliot declared that the Harvard Cosmopolitan Club was the most interesting club in the university. This numbers over two hundred members. One of the most successful chapters, that at Cornell, has erected a beautiful building, costing \$30,000, which admirably houses the representatives of over twenty nations who meet in cordial good fellowship in its Cosmopolitan Club. A former member, George W. Nasmyth, an able physicist, now pursuing his higher studies in Germany, fired with enthusiasm to extend the spirit of these clubs, took the initiative, in 1911, in establishing an *Internationaler Studenten Verein* in the University of Berlin and another in the University of Leipzig. He has since organised

strong clubs in Munich and Göttingen, and a students' committee has been organised in Great Britain to reach all the British universities. Dr. Nasmyth's ambition is to see clubs established in every university in Europe, and he is now actively engaged in carrying out this project.

As a rule, only one third or one half of the members of our Cosmopolitan Clubs can be Americans; but there is a desire to increase this proportion, as foreigners chiefly seek acquaintance with Americans. The latter are selected from those students who have sympathy with foreigners, and these have shown themselves careful not to take too many offices nor use undue influence. For the most part, the foreign students are exceedingly brainy and courteous men, more interested in professional work than in amusement,—in short, picked men, whose future influence is sure to be great, especially when they come from the Orient.

At this moment, when hundreds of millions beyond the Pacific are awakening to the significance of Western science, with the new hope of throwing off the burden of poverty and of developing national resources in the huge, infant republic of China, the impressions which these thoughtful youths carry back to convey to their compatriots become a matter of world importance. What they gain by hard labour in laboratory and classroom is of even less importance than what they acquire by daily contact with our American life. That they should be presented the best aspects

of this, that they should make warm friendships with Americans, and carry home a conviction that this nation stands for justice and peace and goodwill, is a matter of national importance. It is incumbent not only on the American members of the Cosmopolitan Clubs, but on churches and other associations, to see that special courtesies and hospitality are offered to these quiet, keen observers, now sent here from China in increasing numbers by the fund returned from the Boxer indemnity. Mr. Guoktsai Chao, of Shanghai, an alumnus of the University of Wisconsin, who as professor of political science in a Chinese college is destined to influence the new China, gave his reason for choosing the Wisconsin institution:

The ignorance of China on the part of Americans has been the cause of numerous deplorable misunderstandings and is the result of lack of intercourse between two peoples. To remedy this situation, nothing can be better than for the Chinese students to mingle with the Americans, and let them learn from the living representatives instead of from the coloured tales of China. Thus, when I learned there were very few Chinese students in Madison, I came.

It is interesting to observe that from the University of Wisconsin its baseball team was sent to Japan, in August, 1909, to play a series of ten games with the Keio University team. It was royally entertained, and the experience served as one little link to bind together in sympathy the

two nations whose friendship will be one of their strongest assets. This visit was returned by the teams from the Waseda and Keio Universities, which made a tour of all the leading American colleges and were everywhere received with enthusiasm.

The meetings of the clubs are sometimes for lectures, but are largely social, with musical and dramatic features supplied in turn by each nationality. The flags of all the nations represented decorate the walls, and curios are presented and quaint customs and dances illustrated from time to time. Here a Russian Jew in an engineering course sits beside a Japanese in the course in political economy, both listening to a Filipino band playing native airs, or to a North American talking football or politics, or a South American discussing coffee-raising or Bolivar. Each is for the time emancipated from self-consciousness and the limitations of his race and native district, and in turn is teacher and pupil of his fellows. Whether one is Jewish or Buddhist in religion matters little, if he only shows himself a "jolly good fellow."

In order to correct erroneous impressions in their native lands concerning America, many members have pledged themselves to give accounts in their native papers and periodicals of American life and its educational privileges. "There never was a more loyal son of an *alma mater* than the foreign student," says Louis P. Lochner of the University of Wisconsin, himself a prime agent in the Cosmo-

politan Club movement and editor of the *Cosmopolitan Student*, the monthly organ of the clubs. "They cannot help but carry home with them the message of peace on earth, good-will to men."

The Cosmopolitan Club leaders have been of great service to the body of European students banded together for somewhat similar purposes, known as the "Corda Fratres." At the biennial meeting of the latter society, held at The Hague in August, 1909, representatives of our Cosmopolitan Clubs, at a critical period in the history of Corda Fratres, when two elements were discordant, were asked to act as umpires, and succeeded so admirably that the society took a new lease of life. Its central administration will be at different periods in different countries. In 1911 the administration was assigned to the United States; and the next international congress is to be held at Cornell University in 1913. This International Federation of Students, whose motto, "Corda Fratres," gives it its title, was founded at Turin in 1898, but not very successfully organised until September, 1905, at Liège, Belgium. At first the Federation had been divided into national sections, but it was reorganised so as to discard national lines and to form self-governing local associations as the units of the Federation. Any student, regardless of his political or religious ideas, has a right to become a member, if he is registered in an institution of higher learning. Each member pledges himself to promote the spirit of international

union among the youth and to try to "dissipate the prejudices and hatred which render states reciprocally hostile and always on a war footing," and promote the work of peace and arbitration between nations. It is also the object of the Federation "to put the students themselves into correspondence," and to "ensure reciprocally hosts and friends in the large cities upon occasions of travel." The official language of the Federation is French, together with the language of the country where the Congress is held. International congresses are held once in two years. No practical results have yet been achieved by the European organisation which equal those of the American Cosmopolitan Clubs, which are now affiliated with it. With the co-operation of this able body on this side of the Atlantic and with Dr. Nasmyth as president, and Mr. Lochner as secretary for these two years, it gives promise of great usefulness. Its executive committee has representatives from France, Italy, Hungary, Holland, Sweden, the United States, and South America. Every second term an American will be awarded the international presidency. With the students of the American and European universities gradually enlisted in this great movement, the results for the peace and brotherhood of the nations which may confidently be expected are incalculable.¹

¹For reference to the work of the Intercollegiate Peace Association and other useful educational agencies see the author's pamphlet, "Educational Organisations Promoting International

A NEW PEACE MOVEMENT IN THE EAST

Out of misgoverned, wretched Persia has dawned a movement, now influencing millions of men of different faiths and nationalities in the Near East. While Bahaism, which has had the baptism of terrible persecution, has little new to offer to men familiar with the writings of Channing and other liberal Christians, it is performing a great work in promoting brotherhood and good-will among Mohammedans, Jews, Turks, Egyptians, and Armenians, and it has a profound influence over many in Christian lands. Its purpose is to emphasise whatever doctrines all hold in common, to honour every one's religion, and to serve men of every faith ungrudgingly and gladly. The present exponent of the faith, Abdul Baha Abbas, son of the martyred prophet Beha'o'llah, was himself long a prisoner under the Turks upon the island of Akka near Mount Carmel, and set free upon the deposition of the Sultan. Untravelled and unlearned in the technique of the schools, his marvellous natural ability, his great unselfishness and spiritual wisdom have won for him almost the worship of his followers. His recent visits to England, France, and America, his warm reception by the Christian public, and his enlarged experience have made him recognised everywhere as a real

Friendship," published by the World Peace Foundation, Boston, which, like the other pamphlets published by the Foundation, is sent free to all applicants.

factor in the peace movement. In a recent letter he wrote to the Secretary of the Mohonk Arbitration Conference as follows:

Persia was at one time the centre of religious difference, antagonism, and oppression, to such an extent that pen is unable to describe. The adherents of different nations and religions considered it their religious duty to shed the blood of their opponents; they pillaged and ransacked each other's property and did not fall short of oppressing their own flesh and blood. The hatred between the various religions attained to such a height that they considered each other unclean. Should a Jew enter a Mohammedan home, he would be made to sit upon the ground; if he drank water from a cup, that cup was destroyed or washed again and again; for the Jew was considered unclean. Such was the hatred and rancour among the different religions and nations in Persia.

About sixty years ago His Highness Beha'o'llah through the Heavenly Power proclaimed the oneness of the Kingdom of man in that country and addressing the concourse of humanity said: "*O ye people! Ye are all the fruits of one tree and the leaves of one branch!*"

About fifty years ago in the Book of Akdas, He commanded the people to establish the Universal Peace and summoned all the nations to the Divine Banquet of International Arbitration so that the questions of boundaries, of national honour and property, and of vital interests between nations might be decided by an arbitral court of justice; and that no nation would dare to refuse to abide by their decisions. If any quarrel arise between two nations it must be adjudicated by this international court and be arbi-

trated and decided upon like the judgment rendered by the judge between individuals. If at any time any nation dares to break such a treaty all the other nations must arise to put down this rebellion.

Says one writer—Mr. Remey, a well-known architect and son of an American admiral:

Particularly in the Orient the contrast between the Bahais and other people is very striking. There, the average Oriental and Occidental mingle without contact, each remaining foreign to the other, but the opposite is the case with these very same people when they become touched by the Bahai spirit. Then we see them mingling and associating with one another as members of one family, having the same interests and desires, and united in the same works. Among the Oriental Bahais I saw a love and a devotion to this cause and its principles impossible to describe. It was beyond my comprehension to understand, yet I recognised it. In many countries and among people of every race and of every religion I found such a warm welcome and had such a spirit of friendship and devotion poured out upon me, simply because I was a Bahai, that I felt and saw the blending process at work, uniting the East and the West. This is a force working independently of material conditions. I saw it working under all conditions and amid all surroundings, from those of the half-naked, uneducated man living in his hut, to those of the cultured man of wealth living in his palace.

AN INTERNATIONAL AUXILIARY LANGUAGE

What the telephone has accomplished in furthering swift and easy communication between

men who speak one tongue, the future auxiliary language will accomplish in facilitating communication between nations and provinces which to-day are barred from acquaintance with each other by a babel of two or three hundred different tongues. Some world language is daily becoming more and more a crying need if we are to have an organised world. Despite the wide-spread use of English, its requirement in Japanese high schools, and its rapid replacement of French as a required study in many Continental schools, it is not likely ever to meet the needs of an auxiliary language to be the medium of intercourse between all peoples. Its barbarous orthography, which few English-speaking adults have absolutely mastered and which retards a child's reading by a year, is not the only difficulty. It has irregular verbs, prepositions of very varied application, idioms, ambiguities, and difficulties in pronunciation which make years of effort a necessity to speak and write it fluently. The requirements of an auxiliary language are absolute regularity, no ambiguities, phonetic spelling, elimination of all difficult sounds like the English *th*, the French *u* and nasal sounds, and the German guttural, and the selection of words based on roots familiar to all cultivated Europeans. Whether the best auxiliary language has yet been invented is questionable, but one has so far outstripped all others that to-day it is spoken by a quarter of a million people, has a hundred publications, and is in practical use as a means of com-

munication between business houses all over the world. It has attained entrance into some French and English schools as a regular study, and has exponents in almost every European city, whose names and addresses are registered and who on application serve as interpreters and assistants to travellers from a distance. A sixteen-year-old girl who knows Esperanto may be sent from Lisbon to Bucharest or from Trondhjem to Naples and be met and greeted at each change of cars by some accredited woman who knows this language

Dr. Zamenhof, the inventor of the language, was born in a city of four races, whose varying tongues promoted such constant misunderstanding, and ill-will that his mind was turned to a solution of the problem. Avoiding the folly of some of his predecessors in creating out of their own inner consciousness a purely artificial language of which no word was previously intelligible to any one, he chose as the foundation of his new vocabulary the living roots most common in the five chief languages of Western civilisation, and developed a grammar which may be learned in a few hours. The language looks somewhat uncouth when written, but has the liquid sounds of the Italian when spoken. With the exception of the letter *r*, which is difficult for the Chinese—a difficulty common to every European language,—its pronunciation can easily be achieved by every one.

That this language is subject to structural improvement there is no doubt. It is a growing

language, like every other in use, and will extend its vocabulary rapidly, but in regular fashion. Some of its former devotees are turning to "Ido" as an improved form of Esperanto, but the new dialect has so scanty a following that Esperanto, now fairly well entrenched as a language in practical use, bids fair, in spite of some limitations, to hold the field. All that seems necessary to ensure this is an endowment that would provide for the introduction of the study as a three months' course into commercial schools and high schools in every land, the requirement that consuls shall learn it, and that it shall be introduced at international congresses. To begin *de novo* to produce an absolutely perfect language designed by experts would involve long delay, hostility, and discouragement, though occasional revision of Esperanto by an international conference of experts may be desirable and would not cause confusion. When the House of Representatives passes a resolution, as it has just done, to have its Committee on Education investigate the merits of Esperanto as a means of communication between our country and others, it is evident that lawmakers are realising the imminent necessity for some medium suited to modern business requirements.

The great masses of backward races who in this century will come into commercial relations with Europe and the United States and gradually enter the family of nations should not be halted at the outset by the difficulties of European languages.

Especially do the Orientals require an easy means of intercourse with Occidentals, who will never make any attempt to master Asiatic tongues. An easy auxiliary language which shall avail the Pekin merchant in dealing with Frenchman or Turk or Russian, in filling orders for Brazil or Boston or New Zealand, has become a necessity not only for business, but for world peace. It would be of immense service to scientists and scholars, creating an instant acquaintance with the achievements by their compeers in every land. Especially would the citizens of the smaller nations, the Portuguese, Dutch, Danish, Roumanian, etc., appreciate the power of communication with the great world without the necessity of devoting their school-days so largely to the mastery of many languages. With the increase of scientific knowledge and the enlargement of school curricula, economy of time is increasingly demanded.

The common, crude objection, that an auxiliary language would be artificial and that all live languages must arise spontaneously, is as absurd as an objection to a straight, smooth Roman road because it is not so natural and therefore interesting as a muddy, meandering cowpath. For those who have burdens to bear and must speed onward because the king's business requires haste, the road that has no obstacles must be chosen. The leisurely, privileged classes may still deviate into dozens of picturesque, philological by-paths and learn all the languages that they do now; but for

the workaday world the barrier which makes men deaf and dumb must be removed if prejudice, misunderstanding, and jealous rivalries are to diminish and world organisation become effective in promoting peace and good-will. Esperantists are emancipated from provincialism in thought. They breathe a higher air and gaze on a wider horizon than their fellows. At their annual conventions, they worship in Protestant and Roman Catholic churches in their common tongue, they act plays in which each actor comes from a different nation, they play and sing and talk together with an abandon and enthusiasm which no other international gatherings ever show, gatherings where the interpreters are always in evidence with wearisome translations and each little national group flocks by itself, able at most to converse with only two or three other groups except through the medium of some common language difficult for all. Whether the auxiliary language of the future be Esperanto or some better language, the necessity for some auxiliary language is no longer a matter of question.¹

¹ Sample Esperanto vocabulary:

Domo	House	Pura	Clean
Knabo	Boy	Alta	High
Pano	Bread	Ruĝa	Red
Nazo	Nose	Verda	Green
Vagono	Waggon	Diri	To say
Ĉeko	Cheque	Veni	To come
Hundoj	Dogs	Ami	To love
Filioj	Sons	Skribi	To write

CHAPTER XV

WHAT MIGHT HAVE BEEN, HAS BEEN, AND WILL BE ACHIEVED

THREE weeks before Paul Kruger's "ultimatum," Joseph Chamberlain refused to refer the South African difficulties to an arbitration board of two Dutch and three British chief justices. Had he done so, England would have saved three years of bitterness, a setback to all local progress and reform, and the hatred of a people who lost 20,000 women and children in concentration camps; she would have saved \$1,100,000,000, which might have given that third of England's population who are living in dire poverty on less than \$6 a week per *family* all of the following things:

- 100 Old People's Homes, at \$100,000 each.
- 1000 Public Playgrounds, at \$50,000 each.
- 1000 Public Libraries, at \$50,000 each.
- 1000 Trade Schools, at \$200,000 each.
- 500 Hospitals, at \$200,000 each.
- 3000 Public Schools, at \$100,000 each.
- 150,000 Workingmen's Houses, at \$2000 each.

Two years after the war, England was paying \$400,000 a week to keep up her army in South Africa, while one quarter of her own people at home went hungry. To-day Russia is buying battleships, while millions of her people starve.¹

The National Bureau of Education in 1910 asked Congress for an additional appropriation of \$75,000, to enable it to meet constantly growing demands and opportunities for service. It got \$7600—about one tenth of what it asked. Glen Edwards, of the Russell Sage Foundation, was prompted by this parsimony to the following pregnant and startling word in the *Journal of Education*:

In no other department of national activity has advance been so slow and difficult as in that which is represented by the Bureau of Education. It has tried year after year for nearly fifty years to win the favour of an unsympathetic Congress. This it has failed absolutely to do,

A few weeks ago one of the most stupendous engines of war ever built by civilised man slid over the ways and into the water at Norfolk, Va. She will carry in her main battery 12 twelve-inch guns, valued at \$720,000; or more than enough to pay the salaries of the entire force now employed in the Bureau of Education for twelve years. She will carry 21 five-inch guns, valued at \$193,200; or more than enough to employ a force of ten field specialists in education for six years. She will cost the nation \$9,000,000 in

¹See the author's *Primer of the Peace Movement*.

What has been and will be Achieved 227

repairs and maintenance in 20 years; or nearly three and one half times as much as the bureau has cost the government in more than 40 years. At the end of 20 years she will have depreciated in value 100 per cent., and will have cost the nation to build and support in time of peace not less than \$20,000,000; or nearly four and one half times as much as the work of the bureau, including the Alaska service, has cost in more than four decades. Have we anything to show what this war vessel really means? In the filthy mud of a foreign port lies her prototype, a grisly, forsaken memorial to wicked sacrifices of human life, misuse of man's most heroic qualities, wounds, greed, starvation, disease, suffering, sorrow, grief, and the widows and the orphans of civilised nations. This is what it all means in the last analysis. As these facts drive their way to our hearts, is it a pleasant thing to learn that, while the whole country is alive to the need of a fuller knowledge concerning facts of human life and happiness, there are men who refuse \$75,000 to the Bureau of Education, and permit themselves a few days later to grace with pomp and ceremony the launching of an \$11,000,000 battleship?

One day in the spring of 1910, a man of power, on whom the eyes of the civilised globe were centred, had in his hands the greatest opportunity ever vouchsafed to mortal to fire the imagination and enthusiasm of Christendom, and become *par excellence* the Peacemaker of the world. He had held the highest office in one of the richest and most powerful of nations; he had by his commanding personality fascinated the youth of every land; he

had been the guest of the great monarchs of the earth; he had shown a scholarship, a versatility, an audacity which had won the admiration of all classes. His name was on every lip. His slightest word was cabled to the antipodes. He had been awarded the Nobel prize, and was to be honoured in Christiania because of his great contributions to the cause of peace and arbitration. Statesmen of every land, seeing their nations' war budgets grow portentously, the war-weary peoples, and the pacifists waited with bated breath for his forthcoming pronunciamento. Untrammelled by the yoke of office, the most conspicuous and influential private citizen of the world, he could say freely the most advanced word ever uttered as to the folly of huge armaments, the necessity for an instant halt in their increase, and the settlement of all international questions whatsoever by peaceful means.

The little address, as short as possible, was soon over, and was simultaneously printed in America and every other land. It was a good address, as good as most men had expected, but it fell pitifully short of its possibilities, for the speaker's heart did not burn to set men on fire with holy zeal for Peace. Had he been inspired with that profound confidence in the power of right and in the willingness of nations under sacred vows to be true to their high pledges, which confidence has marked his successor in the presidential chair as one of the pioneers of civilisation; had he there solemnly

appealed to Christendom to cease war and "war games" and concentrate its energies upon the problem of better understanding and world organisation; and had he forthwith consecrated the remainder of his life to nothing smaller or less glorious than substituting the scales of justice for the sword of Mars, he might have stood for ever in the forefront of all nations, as the Father of a Federated World. Such might-have-beens might be indefinitely multiplied and the list prove a solemn impeachment and admonition. It is more fortifying to contemplate some of the actual achievements for world organisation in recent times; and happily the list is no inconsiderable one; some of these strong steps are the following:

1. The establishment of some degree of representative government in practically all independent nations, even in China, and the peaceful union of small states to form larger ones, as in Italy and Germany.

2. The establishment of a Permanent Tribunal of Arbitration at The Hague in 1901, with provision for Mediation and International Commissions of Enquiry.

3. The provision for a Prize Court to decide upon captures made at sea in time of war.

4. Treaties between all the Central American states and also between some other nations to submit all differences between them to an international court.

5. Provision for any one of the forty-four

nations signatory to the Hague conventions to take its case to the Hague Court, whether its opponent agree or not.

6. Prohibition against bombarding or laying tribute on unfortified places.

7. Agreement for a Permanent Court of Arbitral Justice.

8. The Porter-Drago convention of 1907, which compels measures that would practically prevent the use of force to collect contractual debts.

9. The establishment of an International Institute of Agriculture in Rome by treaties between forty-seven nations.

10. The International Postal Union, embracing the globe, and hundreds of unofficial international organisations.

11. Endowments amounting to the cost of one battleship, to promote justice and peace between nations.

12. Provision for a third Hague Conference not later than 1915.

This is surely a cheering record. Few could have believed a generation ago that we should see so much achieved to-day. What has been achieved is a guarantee of the larger things that will be achieved; and the following are the chief tasks to which we have to address ourselves in the period just before us:

1. Treaties by all nations pledging reference of all disputes whatsoever to diplomacy, arbitration,

or an International Court of Arbitral Justice yet to be established.

2. The development of Hague Conferences into a stated World Congress, at first only advisory, but gradually increasing its powers and evolving a code of international law. This will deal not only with measures to preserve peace, but with quarantine, commerce, tariff, and all matters which affect international relations.

3. Gradual disarmament and transference of troops from the military to the civic service of the state.

4. A small International Police for land and sea.

These measures will not do away with the use of militia nor with the possibility of civil war for an indefinite time; but they will end our barbarous international duels by substituting the System of Law for the System of War.

APPENDIX

I

PEACE CONGRESSES

THE first International Peace Congress was planned in Boston and was held in London in 1843. Of its three hundred delegates from Peace Societies, thirty were from the United States. The second Congress received its impulse from Elihu Burritt, and was held in Brussels in 1848. The third, in Paris, in 1849, had an attendance of two thousand, and was presided over by Victor Hugo. The fourth was in Frankfort in 1850; and the fifth in London in 1851. Burritt was an active promoter of all of these last.

The International Peace Congresses were revived in 1889, and have been held in order as follows: Paris, London, Rome, Berne, Chicago, Antwerp, Buda-Pest, Hamburg, Turin, Berne, Paris, Glasgow, Monaco, Rouen, Boston, Lucerne, Milan, Munich, London, Stockholm, and Geneva.

The Congress of 1893 met in Chicago, and the Congress of 1904 in Boston, in October. It was addressed by Secretary Hay, and was the largest

International Peace Congress ever held; it was followed by great meetings in many American cities, addressed by the Baroness von Suttner and other foreign delegates as well as by American speakers. International Peace Congresses are arranged by the International Bureau of Peace at Berne, the central agency of the peace societies of the world.

National Peace Congresses are now held annually in Great Britain, France, and Germany. The first American National Peace Congress was held in Carnegie Hall, New York, April 14-17, 1907, to arouse public sentiment regarding the points to be considered at the Second Hague Conference. Thirty-nine States and Territories were represented; Andrew Carnegie presided, and Secretary Elihu Root was one of the speakers. The second National Congress was held in Chicago in 1909. The third Congress was held in Baltimore in 1911 with President Taft, Cardinal Gibbons, and Mr. Carnegie as speakers at the great opening session. For the first time since peace congresses were inaugurated, the head of a nation honoured it by participation in its exercises.

Two National Arbitration Conferences were held in Washington in 1896 and 1904. The Mohonk Arbitration Conferences, beginning in 1895, have been held annually, for invited guests, and their published reports grow yearly more and more invaluable.

II

SEMI-OFFICIAL INTERNATIONAL CONGRESSES IN
RECENT YEARS¹

- 1901. International Sugar Conference, Brussels.
- 1902. International Congress of Navigation, Düsseldorf.
- 1902. International Maritime Congress, Copenhagen.
- 1902. International American Sanitary Conference, Washington.
- 1903. International Telegraphic Conference, London.
- 1903. International Seismological Conference, Strasburg.
- 1903. Preliminary International Conference on Wireless Telegraphy, Berlin.
- 1903. International Sanitary Conference, Paris.
- 1904. International Conference of Private International Law, The Hague.
- 1904. International Congress of Automobile Navigation, Paris.
- 1905. International Pan-American Medical Congress, Panama.
- 1905. International Conference of Maritime Law, Brussels.
- 1905. International Conference on the Transportation of Merchandise by Railroads, Berne.

¹ This list is given as illustrating the rapid growth of the international organization of the world's various interests. See *La Vie Internationale* and Professor Reinsch's *International Unions*.

1905. International American Sanitary Conference, Washington.
1906. International Postal Congress, Rome.
1906. International Pan-American Conference, Rio de Janeiro.
1906. International Congress of Industrial Property, Milan.
1906. International Congress for the Protection of Workmen, Berne.
1906. International Conference on Wireless Telegraphy, Berlin.
1907. International Conference of the Technical Union of Railroads (European), Berne.
1907. International Sugar Conference, Brussels.
1907. International Congress of Artistic and Literary Property, Neufchâtel.
1907. International Congress of Industrial Property, Düsseldorf.
1907. International Conference on Weights and Measures, Paris.
1907. International Central American Peace Conference, Washington.
1907. International American Sanitary Conference, Mexico.
1907. International Sanitary Conference, Rome.
1908. International Conference on the Régime of Arms in Africa, Brussels.
1908. International Telegraphic Conference, Lisbon.
1908. International Pan-American Medical Congress, Guatemala.
1908. International Congress on Maritime Salvage, Nantes.

- 1908. International Conference on Naval Law of War, London.
- 1908. International Pan-American Scientific Congress, Santiago, Chile.
- 1909. International Central American Peace Conference, Tegucigalpa.
- 1909. International Congress against the Use of Opium, Shanghai.
- 1909. International American Sanitary Conference, San José, Costa Rica.
- 1910. International Pan-American Conference, Buenos Aires.
- 1910. International Congress of Railroads, Berne.
- 1910. International Congress of the Union of Penal Law, Brussels.
- 1911. International Congress of Fisheries, Rome.
- 1911. International Conference of the Maritime Committee, Bremen.

III

THE CZAR'S MANIFESTO, AUGUST, 1898

Nicholas II, the Czar of Russia, has directed his Minister of Foreign Affairs to present to all the representatives of foreign nations in St. Petersburg the following communication:

The maintenance of general peace and the possible reduction of the excessive armaments which weigh upon all nations present themselves in the existing condition of the whole world as an ideal toward which the endeavours of all government should be directed.

His Majesty the Emperor, my august master, has been won over to this view. In the conviction that this lofty aim is in conformity with the most essential interests and legitimate views of all the powers, the Imperial Government thinks the present moment would be very favourable to seek by means of international discussion the most effectual means of insuring to all peoples the benefits of real and durable peace, and, above all, of putting an end to the progressive development of the present armaments.

In the course of the last twenty years the longings for general pacification have grown especially pronounced in the consciences of civilised nations. The preservation of peace has been put forward as the object of international policy. It is in its name that the great states have concluded between themselves powerful alliances. It is the better to guarantee peace that they have developed in proportions hitherto unprecedented their military forces, and still continue to increase them without shrinking from any sacrifice.

All these efforts, nevertheless, have not yet been able to bring about the beneficent results of the desired pacification.

Financial changes, following an upward march, strike at public property, and at the very source of intellectual and physical strength. Nations' labour and capital are for the major part diverted from their natural application and unproductively consumed. Hundreds of millions are devoted to acquiring terrible engines of destruction which, though to-day regarded as the last work of science, are destined to-morrow to lose all value in consequence of some fresh discovery in the same field. National culture, economic pro-

gress, and the production of wealth are either paralysed or checked in development.

Moreover, in proportion as the armaments of each power increase, so do they less and less fulfil the object which the governments have set before themselves.

Economic crises, due in great part to the system of armaments *à outrance*, and the continual danger which lies in this massing of war material, are transforming the armed peace of our days into a crushing burden which the peoples have more and more difficulty in bearing.

It appears evident, then, that if this state of things is prolonged it will inevitably lead to the very cataclysm which it is desired to avert, and the horrors of which make every thinking being shudder in advance.

To put an end to these incessant armaments and to seek a means of warding off the calamities that are threatening the whole world is a supreme duty which to-day is imposed on all states.

Filled with this idea, his Majesty has been pleased to order that I propose to all the governments whose representatives are accredited to the Imperial Court the meeting of a conference which would have to occupy itself with this grave problem.

MOURAVIEFF.

In January, 1899, Count Muravieff issued in behalf of the Czar a programme covering eight points, several of which dealt with questions bearing on lessening the horrors of war and the interests of the Red Cross. The eighth, however, introduced a profoundly important new idea:

To accept in principle the employment of the good offices of mediation and optional arbitration in cases lending themselves thereto, with the object of preventing armed conflicts between nations; and to come to an understanding with respect to the mode of applying those good offices and to establish a uniform practice in using them.

In response to these manifestoes of the Czar the First Hague Conference met in 1899.

IV

RESULTS OF THE SECOND HAGUE CONFERENCE, 1907

The official announcement of the results of the Second Hague Conference was as follows:

1. The peaceful regulation of international conflicts.
2. Providing for an International Prize Court.
3. Regulating the rights and duties of neutrals on land.
4. Regulating rights and duties of neutrals at sea.
5. Covering the laying of submarine mines.
6. Prohibiting the bombardment of towns from the sea.
7. The matter of collection of contractual debts.
8. Covering the transformation of merchantmen into war-ships.

9. The treatment of captured crews.
10. The inviolability of fishing boats.
11. The inviolability of the postal service.
12. The application of the Geneva Convention and the Red Cross to sea warfare, and
13. The laws and customs regulating land warfare.

Reserved for the Future

This Conference was not a Congress; it was merely for an exchange of views, and its action was not binding upon any nation unless its government should thereafter sign a general treaty, pledging itself to carry out the principles and the policy recommended by the Conference as to the above propositions which were unanimously agreed upon. In addition to those, the Conference adopted several other resolutions, and made several other declarations of principles by a majority vote. But because they were not unanimously supported, the action was not final, and the subjects were referred back to the forty-four governments for future consideration. They will certainly be revived at the next conference, and are as follows:

1. Recommendation in favour of obligatory arbitration.
2. In favour of a Permanent Court of Arbitration.
3. In favour of the limitation of armaments.

4. That balloons shall not be used in war for the throwing of explosives.
5. The prohibition of unnecessarily cruel bullets in warfare.
6. The co-operation of all the nations in the building of the Palace of Peace.

V

THE COST OF ARMAMENTS

The Army, Navy, and Pension Bill of the United States for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1911.

Expended for	Amount.	Percentage of Total Expenditures
Army	\$162,357,101	24.8
Navy	120,728,786	18.5
Army and navy	\$283,085,887	43.3
Past war (pensions)	157,980,573	24.1
Total war expenditures	\$441,066,462	*67.4
All civil purposes	213,071,536	32.6
	\$654,137,998	100.0

* Showing that more than two thirds of the present total annual expenditure of the Government of the United States is for expenses incurred in past wars and in preparation for problematical future wars, leaving less than one third for all civil constructive purposes. Some years the proportion for war has been 70 per cent.

*Proportion of Total Military Charges to Total
Expenditures of Ten Nations.*

Country.	Total Expenditures.	Cost of Army and Navy	%
Austria-Hungary	* \$890,656,000	\$87,244,000	09.8
France	877,292,000	270,918,000	30.9
Germany	731,286,000	318,446,000	43.5
Great Britain	997,410,000	341,820,000	34.3
Italy	500,595,000	120,676,000	24.1
Japan	284,452,000	92,601,000	32.5
Russia	1,360,054,000	319,770,000	23.5
Spain	224,526,000	51,367,000	22.9
Turkey	154,033,000	48,294,000	31.4
United States	654,138,000	283,086,000	43.3}
Totals	\$6,674,442,000	\$1,934,222,000	29.0

* This is probably larger than it should be. It is difficult to separate the imperial expenses from those chargeable to the two separate nations.

During the life of the Republic, we have spent for all purposes over \$21,500,000,000. OF THIS \$16,000,000,000 WAS DUE TO WAR AND ITS INCIDENTS. We are spending for defence more than France, only about \$35,000,000 less than Germany, and \$58,000,000 less than Great Britain. While our population increased thirty-five per cent. in sixteen years, our naval expenditures increased six hundred per cent.

The civilised world now spends on armies and navies annually \$2,250,000,000. This is one of the primary causes of increased cost of living.

The interest alone on the war debt of the world

is fifteen hundred millions of dollars. Should war cease to-day our children unto the third and fourth generation would be bending their backs under the accumulated burden of war debts of past centuries. Said Franklin: "War is not paid for in war time. The bill is paid in time to come."¹

Perhaps the chief cause of England's huge bill for armaments is indicated in the list, published by the *Morning Leader*, of six companies which supply armaments, whose total issued share capital is £17,601,395, and their debenture capital, £10,180,468. These are Vickers Sons & Maxim; Camwell, Laird & Co.; Wm. Beardmore & Co.; John Brown & Co.; Thames Ironworks Co.; Armstrong, Whitworth & Co. Among the shareholders of three of these alone are 3 dukes, 2 marquises, 120 members of earls' or barons' families, 30 knights, 13 members of Parliament, 43 military or naval officers, besides financiers, proprietors of newspapers, and naval architects.

VI

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

President, HON. THEODORE E. BURTON,
Secretary, DR. BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD
Executive Director, ARTHUR D. CALL.

¹See pamphlets on "The Drain of Armaments" and "Syndicates for War," published by the World Peace Foundation, Boston, which are sent freely to all applicants.

Organised in New York City, May 8, 1828. Formed by the merging of many State and local societies, the oldest of which, the New York Peace Society, the first in the world, dated back to 1815.

Early offered a prize of \$1000 for the best essay on a Congress of Nations. In 1840 published a large volume, *Prize Essays on a Congress of Nations*, which anticipated, especially in the contribution of William Ladd, practically all that has been embodied in the Hague Conferences and Court.

Offered a prize of \$500 for the best review of the Mexican War, and the literature thus evoked was a distinct contribution to American history.

Much of the great literature of the peace movement was originally produced for the annual meetings and conferences of the Society (*e.g.*, Channing's, Emerson's Sumner's, Jay's, and Burritt's addresses).

The first society to espouse the peace cause on the Continent of Europe was organised at the instigation of this Society.

The international peace congresses practically originated with the American Peace Society, although at the suggestion of Joseph Sturge, then visiting America, and to all of these congresses it has sent strong delegations.

The International Law Association resulted from an extended European tour of Dr. James B. Miles, the Society's Secretary, in 1873.

Since 1835 it has worked to influence State legis-

latures and Congress in behalf of an International Congress and Court.

In 1871 it organised great Peace Jubilees throughout the country.

The Pan-American Congress, out of which grew the International Bureau of American Republics, was authorised after numerous petitions had been presented to Congress by this Society.

The Secretary of the Society has been annually chosen a member of the Commission of the International Peace Bureau at Berne since the second year of the Bureau's existence, 1892.

The Society has constantly and earnestly worked for arbitration treaties.

It kept a representative at The Hague during the First Conference, 1899, when the International Court of Arbitration was created.

Every year it issues thousands of pamphlets, supplying literature to colleges and universities, it has a corps of lecturers, and publishes 18th of May exercises for schools.

It publishes an able monthly journal, the *Advocate of Peace*.

It organises the National Peace Congresses, and co-operates in arranging the International Peace Congresses.

It has many branch societies in various States and cities, which were federated in 1912, giving the central society a representative government; and it co-operates with the other peace agencies of the country.

INDEX

A

Abbas, Abdul Baha, 217
 Adler, Dr. Felix, 62
 Agriculture, International In-
 stitute of, 48-55, 230
 Angell, Norman, 11, 67, 124,
 141-152, 174
 Asser, T. M. C., 200

B

Bahaism, 217-219
 Baha'o'llah, 217, 218
 Beernaert, M. Auguste, 12, 58
 Bieberstein, Baron Marschall
 von, 19
 Bismarck, 146
 Bloch, Jean de, 11, 13, 14, 136-
 139, 142
 Bolivar, Simon, 195
 Bourgeois, Leon, 14
 Brewer, Justice, 116, 205
 Bright, John, 11
 Bryan, Wm. J., 100
 Burritt, Elihu, 11, 142, 244
 Butler, Pres. Nicholas Murray,
 203, 205

C

Carnegie, Andrew, 1, 49, 198,
 201, 233
 Carnegie, Endowment, 201-
 204
 Central America, 109, 197
 Channing, Wm. Ellery, 10,
 244

Choate, Hon. Joseph H., 20,
 113
 Christ of the Andes, 98, 196
 Clark, Prof. John B., 202
 Cobden, Richard, 11, 100, 142,
 161
 Conference, American on Arbi-
 tration, 233
 Conference, Interparliamen-
 tary, 12
 Conference, Pan-American, 19,
 41, 195, 245
 Congress, International Peace,
 10, 231, 233, Semi-official,
 234
 Congress, National Peace, 93,
 100, 207, 245
 Congress, Universal Races, 62
 Corda Fratres, 215
 Cosmopolitan Clubs, 210-216
 Court, International of Arbi-
 tral Justice, 192, 230, 231
 Court, International Prize, 229,
 239
 Court, Supreme, 9, 16, 99,
 107, 117
 Cremer, William R., 12
 Crucé, Eméric, 3
 Czar of Russia, 13, 14, 18, 19,
 44, 50, 73
 Czar's Manifesto, 236-239

D

Dante, 2, 98
 Design, the Great, 3
 D'Estournelles de Constant,
 Baron, 16, 207

De Forest, John H., 34, 37, 39
 De Staal, Ambassador, 14
 Dewey, Admiral, 27
 Diaz, President, 17
 Dodge, David L., 10
 Dogger Bank, 17
 Drago, Dr., 43
 Du Bois, Pierre, 2, 3

E

Education, National Bureau
 of, 226
 Eliot, Charles W., 105
 Esperanto, 221-224

F

Foster, John W., 36, 37, 205
 Fox, George, 5
 Franco-Prussian War, 147
 Franklin, Benjamin, 7, 176,
 243
 Funston, General, 123

G

Garrison, Wm. Lloyd, 93
 Ginn, Edwin, 200, 204

H

Hague Conferences, 10, 12, 19,
 21, 42, 69, 80, 95, 113,
 115, 119, 197, 198, 205, 208,
 230, 231, 239, 240
 Hague Court or Tribunal, 9,
 16, 17, 18, 95, 191, 192, 193,
 205, 229
 Hale, Edward Everett, 205
 Hay, John, 68, 231
 Henry IV., 3
 Hoar, Sen., 123
 Hobson, Richmond P., 29, 30,
 34
 Hohenlohe, Chancellor von, 15
 Holls, Frederick W., 14, 15
 Hugo, Victor, 11, 232

I

Inquiry, High Commission of,
 193, 194
 Institutions, International
 Central Bureau of, 55-59
 International Conciliation As-
 sociation, 203
 Interparliamentary Union, 12,
 19, 108, 194

J

Jay, John, 191
 Jordan, Pres. David Starr, 174,
 201

K

Kant, Immanuel, 6, 7, 161
 Kaiser of Germany, 13, 15

L

Ladd, Wm., 11
 La Fontaine, Henri, 58
 Law Association, Interna-
 tional, 244
 Lodge, Henry Cabot, 66
 Loreburn, Lord, 114
 Lubin, David, 49-53

M

Mahan, Admiral, 91-110, 116
 Mead, Edwin D., 201
 Mohonk Arbitration Confer-
 ence, 204-206, 233
 Monroe Doctrine, 40, 41
 Münster, Count, 15

N

Nasmyth, Dr. George W., 201,
 211, 212, 216
 Navy League, 74-78
 Nelidoff, M., 19
 Nobel, Alfred, 199
 Nobel Peace Prize Recipients,
 200

P

- Pan-American Union, 59-61, 245
 Pauncefote, Lord, 14
 Peace Budget, 108-110
 Peace Bureau, International, 59, 203, 207, 233, 245
 Peace Society, American, 243-246
 Penn, William, 6
 Permanent International Tribunal or Court (See Hague Court)
 Perry, Commodore, 35
 Philippines, 31, 32, 42, 111, 121-134
 Pious Fund, 192
 Police, 103-105
 Police, International, 231
 Porter-Drago Doctrine, 40, 230
 Porter, Gen. Horace, 20
 Portsmouth Treaty, 18
 Postal Union, Universal, 230

R

- Raiffeisen System, 54
 "Rights of War and Peace," 3, 4
 Roosevelt, Theodore, 16, 18, 67, 68, 163, 198
 Root, Elihu, 37, 43, 59, 109

S

- School Peace League, American, 168, 201, 206-208

- School Peace League, British, 209
 Scott, Dr. James Brown, 202
 Seabury Prizes, 208
 Smiley, Albert K., 204
 Speyer, James, 100
 Stead, Wm. T., 13, 14, 21, 137
 Straus, Hon. Oscar S., 100, 205
 Sully, duke of, 3
 Sumner, Charles, 11, 85, 142, 161, 244
 Suttner, Baroness Bertha von, 14, 15, 21, 199, 233

T

- Taft, William Howard, 37, 40, 129, 193, 195, 233
 Togo, Admiral, 18

W

- Washington, 7, 27, 81, 113, 163, 195
 Weardale, Lord, 62, 194
 White, Andrew D., 4, 14, 113, 206
 Wood, Gen. Leonard, 70
 Woodford, Gen. Stewart L., 25
 Worcester, Noah, 10
 World Peace Foundation, 83, 200, 208, 243
 Wright, Ambassador Luke E., 37

Z

- Zorn, Prof., 15
 Zamenhof, Dr., 221

DATE DUE

OCT 28 1978

DEC 20 1978

MAR 3 1989

APR 17 1989

MAR 26 1990

MAR 19 1990

261-2500

Printed
in USA

011955

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA
Library
VICTORIA, B.C.

